



THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIV.—OCTOBER, 1899.—No. 96.

THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC AS A PERSECUTOR OF THE CHURCH.

“**T**HE republican form of government is that which divides us the least,” said Thiers in the first days of 1871. A bitter enemy of the legitimate royalty, and therefore unwilling to play the game of a Monck; an inveterate skeptic, and therefore unable to pose as a Washington; entertaining a velleity in favor of the younger and traitorous branch of the Bourbons, because its cause was that of an alliance between the Revolution and a veneer of respectability; the ex-Orleanist Minister should rather have avowed that he advocated the republican system, because it alone then furnished him an opportunity of becoming the head of the State. During the entire political career of this chameleon-like statesman, if the grandeur and prosperity of France ever engaged his attention, it was after a merely secondary fashion; power for himself, to be attained by any and every means, was the sole end of his policy. With reason did Lamartine thus apostrophize him: “In you there is no principle; but there is a passion—the passion to govern, to govern alone, to govern always, to govern with and against all, to govern at any price.” It was this unscrupulous lust of power, too ignoble to merit the name of ambition, that led Thiers to associate himself with men whom he had hitherto termed “furious madmen”—men whose alliance, as he said, “could be nothing else than a cheating game on both sides; a game in which each player was a liar in the mind of his neighbor; a compromise which rendered all engaged in it unworthy of public respect.” No wonder, therefore, that when,

on May 24, 1873, Thiers tendered his resignation of the presidency to the National Assembly, hoping that it would not be accepted, this truly able man, after forty years of governmental experience which could not endow him with the faculty of organization, was relegated to private life.¹ When the reins of power were assumed by Marshal MacMahon, eleven hours after the retirement of Thiers, the lovers of law and order conceived great hopes for France, and the ever-sanguine partisans of Legitimacy fancied that Henry V. would soon mount the throne of his ancestors. The trust of the Legitimists seemed indeed to be well founded when, on August 5, the Comte de Paris, head of the hitherto rebellious Orleans branch of the Bourbons, repaired to Frohsdorff, the residence of the Comte de Chambord, and formally acknowledged that Prince as King of France and of Navarre, thus tendering an *amende* for the treachery of Philippe-Egalité, and for the usurpation of Louis Philippe. It is generally supposed that the failure of these royalist anticipations was due to the too straightforward letter in which the Comte de Chambord declared that he would never ascend the throne of St. Louis as "King of the Revolution;" that he would decline a sceptre which would be a symbol of principles which he detested. It is certain that this letter caused a division in the royalist ranks; that the nondescripts who are styled "Liberal Catholics" could not bring themselves to place principle above fancied utility. But it is more than probable that the failure of the royalist restoration was chiefly due to the machinations of Bismarck and of the Masonic Order. The publication of the Arnim documents showed that Bismarck regarded it as the interest of Germany to prevent a coronation of Henry V. as King of France; that the astute and phenomenally unprincipled chancellor felt that with the restoration of her legitimate monarchy France would recover her ancient glory. In the despatches revealed by the Arnim affair we read that "Germany need fear nothing from either the Republic or the Empire;" that "it is for the interest of Germany that France should remain weak and without allies;" that "the Republic, and if not the Republic, the Empire, will furnish the least probability of a resurrection of France," and that "a monarchical France would be a danger for Germany." Dr. Busch tells us that one day at table Bismarck exclaimed to him: "There must be no Bourbons or Orleans in

¹ Thiers died suddenly, while seated at dinner with his wife, on September 3, 1877. Whether he had ever made his First Communion is doubtful. Certainly during the greater part of his life he was an avowed Deist, somewhat after the fashion of Voltaire. However, in his later years he frequently insisted on his Catholicism, and at the beginning of his last will and testament these words were found: "I am a Catholic, and intend to die a Catholic." Therefore, when Mme. Thiers requested that a Christian funeral should be accorded to her husband, no objection was made by the ecclesiastical authorities. VILLEFRANCHE; "Adolphe Thiers," in the "Illustrious Persons of the Nineteenth Century." Paris, 1882.

France!" As for the action of Freemasonry in the matter of Henry V., we know that the Masonic powers scarcely regard it as a secret. The Masonic journal, *La Révolution Française*, in its issue of May 12, 1879, said that when there was a probability of an acclamation of Henry V., "Gambetta prepared and organized throughout France, and even in the army, an insurrection, in comparison with which that of March 18, 1871 (the Commune) would have been mere child's play." It was proved before the tribunals of Autun and Dijon that during the monarchical agitation of 1873 the Masons of Saone-et-Loire planned to kidnap the Marchioness de MacMahon, a relative of the marshal-president, and to hold her as a hostage for the permanence of his republicanism. The chief of this conspiracy was Boyssset, "Venerable" of the Lodge in Chalons, and a deputy in the National Assembly. This latter fact prevented his trial. In the *Echo de Saone-et-Loire*, October 15, 1874, we read that two of the conspirators, the brothers Bontemps, who were leaders in the International, were willing to further the advent of a spurious monarchy rather than the legitimate one of the elder Bourbons, and that accordingly they tendered their services and that of their fellow-sectarians to the Orleans princes. That invaluable Masonic authority, the *Chaine d'Union*, to which we are indebted for so much of our information concerning the Brethren of the Three Points, gives in its issue of July, 1882, a discourse which was pronounced in the Lodge "Free Thought" of Aurillac on the preceding March 4, and from which we cull these morsels: "You know that it is to the grand Revolution of 1789 that we owe the political reforms which have changed the face not only of Europe, but of the entire universe (*sic*). But who prepared, who directed—in a word, who made that Revolution? You, gentlemen, you—Freemasonry, the daughter of the Reformation. And after the Revolution and the Empire, Freemasonry continued the work of the liberation of the peoples. Persecuted by the Restoration, it was not unconcerned with the revolution of 1830. Then it fought Louis Philippe, who was to be, according to Lafayette, the best of republicans, but who was merely the King of the upper *bourgeoisie*. Finally, on May 16 (1877) I see you again at work. When treason had raised the enemies of the Republic to power, you Freemasons rushed into the breach, fighting the foe inch by inch, and finally forcing him to a capitulation in which you buried all hopes of a monarchical restoration."

The administration of President MacMahon, although supported by a Conservative majority in the Senate, was in continual warfare with the Radical majority in the Chamber of Deputies which followed the lead of Gambetta. And this Radical majority of the

lower House was persistently encouraged by all the Bismarckian journals of Germany and by the entire Masonico-Jewish press of the world. In 1877, when monarchical hopes were again reviving, the subsidized Bismarckian journals continually insisted that France, not yet recovered from her wounds of 1870-71, would feel the effects of another German invasion, if the imminent election should prove favorable to the policy of the marshal-president; and all these German journalistic warnings were carefully detailed to the voters by the Masonic agents. Ten days after the triumph of the Radicals at the polls, that is, on October 24, 1877, the Supreme Council of the Scotch Rite of Masons gave a grand banquet to all the brethren whom the Lodges of every land had sent to congratulate the adepts of France. Brother Jules Simon offered a toast "to the triumphant Republic advancing in the future without impediment." Brother Van Humbeek, Grand Master of Belgian Masonry and Minister of Public Instruction in his then sorely-tried country, "congratulated France on the point to which she had arrived." And what was this point? In October, 1872, a year before there was any talk about a monarchical restoration, there had been held in Locarno a "Convent" of the representatives of Continental Masonry. The Orient of Rome was represented by Filippo Cordova; that of Naples by Franchi; that of Palermo by La Vaccara; that of Florence by Andrea Giovanelli; that of Turin by Alberto Mario, and that of Genoa by Quadrio. The Lodges of France were represented by Felix Pyat; those of Hungary by Kossuth; those of Switzerland by Klapka, and those of Prussia by General Etzel. The questions for consideration were proposed by the Prussian, who presided at the sessions: 1. Would democracy be benefitted by a war between the France of Thiers and Italy? 2. How could a provisional government, under the dictatorship of Gambetta, be established in France? 3. What new religion ought to be substituted for Catholicism?¹ It is evident, therefore, that five years before the electoral condemnation of the policy of MacMahon, the votaries of the Dark Lantern had decreed the eventual supremacy of their *confrère* and tool, Gambetta; and certainly the phrase "provisional government under the dictatorship of Gambetta" fitted well the course of that disciplined parliamentary majority which neutralized such good intentions as President MacMahon may have entertained. After a multitude of concessions to the Masonico-Radical spirit of the Deputies, MacMahon finally refused to accept a measure which would have disorganized the army, and when his determination was met with the cry "submit

¹ *L'Univers*, November 12, 1872—*Chaine d'Union*, November, 1878—PACHTLER; "War Against Throne and Altar," p. 158.

or resign," he chose the latter course on January 30, 1879. With the advent of Grévy as president, the French Republic entered on a new phase of existence. The comparatively conservative Cabinet of MacMahon was dismissed, and in the new one the Ministry of Public Instruction was assigned to Jules Ferry.

On March 15 Ferry laid before the Deputies two bills which were aimed at an entire destruction of that freedom of education for which the Catholics of France had so persistently fought in the days of Montalembert, Lacordaire and Ozanam. One of these bills modified the composition and the duties of the Superior Council for Public Instruction, as well as those of the Academic Councils, inasmuch as it conferred all authority in the matter of teaching on the State. The other bill, which directly concerned freedom in the matter of imparting secondary and superior instruction, accorded to the State the exclusive right to examine candidates for academic degrees; it deprived all private institutions of the title and privileges of a university, and by one of its articles, the celebrated Article vii., it pretended to take the right of teaching from every religious organization which was not "authorized" by the government. The Ferry laws were merely the result of the work undertaken by the *Ligue de l'Enseignement* or Educational Association which had been founded in 1866 by Jules Macé, with the active support of Robert, director general under Duruy, then the imperial Minister of Public Instruction. The object of this league was to render all instruction gratuitous, obligatory and, above all, secular; the modicum of freedom of instruction then subsisting, a privilege which the laws of 1833 and 1850 had allowed the Catholic institutions to exercise in their brave endeavors to compete with a governmental university which enjoyed a revenue of fifty-eight millions of francs, was to be entirely abrogated. This association numbered among its active members not only nearly all the professors of the University, but also a majority of the imperial prefects, procurators and other functionaries. Macé proclaimed that this league "would reduce to practice the principles proclaimed in the Lodges," and it is interesting to note that three years afterward, in the Masonic Congress of Metz, it was this same Macé who moved that the name of God should be expunged from the statutes of Masonry—a project which was finally actuated by the Grand Convent held in Paris on September 14, 1877, after consultation with all the Lodges in the obedience of the French Grand Orient.¹ Shortly after the birth of the league, the *Monde Maçonnique*, second only to the *Chaine*

¹ The statutes of the Grand Orient of France had hitherto given as the basis of Masonry "the existence of God, the study of morality and the practice of all virtues." Instead of this rather negative programme, there was now substituted "absolute freedom of conscience and human solidarity."

d'Union as an authority among the more intellectual of the adepts, said: "We are happy to be able to announce that the league founded by Brother J. Macé and also the project of a statue to Brother Voltaire have excited the sympathies of all our Lodges. Certainly no two subscriptions could be more in agreement than that in favor of Voltaire, which means the destruction of prejudice and superstition, and that for the league, which means a new society founded only on science and instruction. All the brethren understand this."¹ And in his circular of July 4, 1870, the Grand Master Babaud-Larivière said: "We are all of one mind in regard to the principle of gratuitous, obligatory and *lay* instruction." On September 24, 1878, at the banquet given by the Grand Orient on the occasion of the Great Exposition, the deputy grand-master of the Belgian Grand Orient, Bourland, thus perorated amid universal applause: "The obstacle to the intellectual development of France—that which is killing her, that which is killing us, that which is killing the entire world—is ignorance and fanaticism, the idea that the world should belong to him who is most daring in weakening the intellectual faculties of man—in brutalizing man. Let us arise against this pretension! Rome, together with Ultramontanism, ignorance and all else that comes from Rome, must perish, because of a development of an education *which will lead to morality*."² In order to obtain funds for their campaign against all religious teaching in schools, the Masons organized the *Œuvre du Sou des Écoles* or Penny Collection for the Schools throughout the Republic, and in order to inspire the people with an enthusiasm which would result in contributions, every kind of festivity was brought into requisition. Thus at the grand festival given by the Lodges of Bordeaux in the public gardens on June 24, 1879, as we learn from the *Monde Maçonnique*, "Just as the last banners of the processions (of Corpus Christi) were re-entering their respective sanctuaries," the ceremonies of irreligion were begun, and in the evening the adepts exhibited a piece of fireworks "which presented 'The Works of Masonry' as its title, and reminded the 17,000 spectators of the object being pursued by the order." Quite properly, therefore, had Macé said in a general meeting of his league on January 18, 1879: "The destiny of our association is so intimately united with that of the Republic that the sole imminence of that senatorial majority, which was to consecrate republican institutions definitely, suffices to precipitate the movement which is directed principally by us." The movement was precipitated on March 7 by the proposition of the laws prepared by Jules Ferry, a Masonic luminary whose brutal materialism had been manifested two years

¹ Issue of April, 1867.

² *Monde Maçonnique*, November, 1878, p. 346.

previously, when the Lodge *Clément Amitié* of Paris gave a banquet in honor of the anniversary of the reception of Littré and Wyroutboff into its bosom: "The Masonic fraternity is something *superior to all dogmas*, to all metaphysical conceptions, and *not only to all religions*, but to all philosophies. I mean that sociability is sufficient unto itself; that social morality has its guarantees and its roots in the human conscience; that it can live by itself; that now at length *it can throw away its theological crutches* and march unfettered to the conquest of the world. You are the most precious instruments for the cultivation of the social sentiment, for the development of social and lay morality. . . . *It is of the essence of Masonry to free man from the fear of death.* To this so ancient fear, to this slavery which it is so hard to crush, you oppose the strengthening and *consoling* sentiment of the continuity of the human species. . . . *When one is animated by this conviction, he has conquered for himself every liberty.*"¹ These remarks of Ferry remind us of the Italian sectarian utterances of Brother Mauro Macchi, Deputy in the Italian Parliament and a member of the Supreme Council of the Italian adepts, when he wrote to the *Masonic Review* in February, 1874: "The keystone of the system which opposes Masonry has always been and is the ascetic and transcendental sentiment which turns the attention of men beyond this life and induces them to consider themselves as mere travelers on earth, urging them to sacrifice everything for a happiness that will begin in the graveyard. *Until this system is destroyed by the mallet of Masonry, society will be composed mainly of poor weaklings who think of nothing but happiness in a future life.*"

Scarcely had Ferry presented his bills in the Chamber when Masonic conferences were convened throughout the Republic for the purpose of creating or augmenting a popular yearning for the blessings of irreligious education. At the conference held in Marseilles on April 5 Brother Gambini, "Venerable" of the Lodge *La Parfaite Sincérité*, drew the attention of his frenzied brethren to: "Brother Jules Ferry, Minister of Public Instruction, endeavoring to render education essentially laic, although he is surrounded by nameless intrigues and assaults on the part of the clerical hordes. . . . But if Brother Ferry is accomplishing a work which is *essentially Masonic*, it is the duty of us Masons to aid him in the fulfilment of his mission. Let him know that he is sustained by an army in reserve which, although it is calm because it is conscious of its power, is ready nevertheless to defend his work with its life."² During the summer of 1879 Ferry made a tour through the south of France, in order to enable the Brethren of the Three Points to incite popular

¹ *Chaine d'Union*, 1877, p. 181.

² *Chaine d'Union*, May, 1879.

demonstrations which might neutralize the opposition of all that was sensible or religious to his projects. Having read the many addresses which were ostentatiously presented to him by the Lodges, we quote as representative of them all some passages from that of the Lodges of Toulouse: "The Masons of Toulouse extend to you a welcome, and tender the sentiments of respect which they feel for a Minister who sustains with persistent courage a combat against the eternal enemies of civil society. Democratic France, laboring France, is with you, and Freemasonry cannot forget that the Minister of Public Instruction is one of her most distinguished sons. Freemasonry will assist you, dear brother, with all the means in her power; for she well understands that . . . it is necessary that French youth be delivered from the snares of the Jesuits. . . . Inform the Government, dear brother, that especially in this matter the Masons of Toulouse are on its side."

The proposition of the second of the Ferry laws, that which practically suppressed the free Faculties and Universities established in virtue of the law of 1875, excited sentiments of horror among the Catholics of France. When it was discussed, eloquent voices pleaded for freedom of teaching and of the religious orders; but hatred of religion led the Deputies to pass Article vii. by a vote of 330 out of 515, and to pass the law as an entirety by a vote of 362 out of 521. In the Senate, however, the propriety and justice of Article vii. were fiercely contested, and the Catholic cause was reinforced by the very unclerical Jules Simon and Laboulaye. The Senatorial vote could not be taken before March 9, 1880, and then the iniquitous article was defeated by a majority of 19, the remainder of the law being accepted. The Deputies adopted the amendment of the Senate. The law concerning the Superior Council and the Academic Councils had been slightly modified, and then passed in February. The rejection of Article vii. was not borne with equanimity by the Masons and other Radicals. Determined to withdraw the youth of France from "the clutches of the Jesuits and other teaching orders," they resuscitated the memory of several laws which had fallen into desuetude—laws which were even contrary to the vaunted principles of 1789, and which had been abolished by non-use and by an enactment of 1850. On March 29, 1880, there appeared decrees of the president, based on laws of 1790 and 1792, on the Napoleonic Concordat and on the Organic Articles which Napoleon had audaciously added to that Concordat. These decrees accorded to the "non-authorized" association which "was styled 'of Jesus,'" a delay of three months, within which term it was to withdraw from all its establishments on French territory. The same delay of three months was granted to all other "non-authorized" or-

ganizations, during which term said bodies "might apply to the government for an approbation of their statutes and rules and for a legal recognition of their establishments which then existed *de facto*. The execution of these decrees began on June 30, the officers having received instructions to finish their work before November. However, in spite of these enactments, several of the affected colleges continued to exist, thanks to the zeal of wealthy Catholics, who bought the confiscated properties and installed therein professors who were not *congréganistes* or members of any order, but who were devoted to the sacred cause of religious education. By the procedure of March 29, 1880, the French Republic declared open war on the Catholic Church; and why should it not have done so, when the Lodges pronounced the incompatibility of Catholicism and Republicanism? On May 9 Courdavaux, professor in the Faculty of Letters at Douay, gave a conference on the Sacred Scriptures (!) before the Lodge *L'Étoile du Nord* of Lille, in which he said: "The distinction between Catholicism and Clericalism is purely official, a subtlety adapted to the exigencies of the platform; but here in the Lodge we may proclaim the truth that Catholicism and Clericalism are one and the same thing. And let us add this conclusion. No man can be both Catholic and Republican. It is impossible."¹ It is refreshing to note the attempted justification of the Cabinet to which he belonged, made by Cazot, then Minister of Justice. In an address to the Lodge *L'Écho du Grand-Orient* of Nimes he said: "According to a phrase that is familiar to you, we have entered on an era of difficulties, and it is not yet closed. We have many combats before us; for instance, the magistracy is to be reformed, so that it may be neither servile nor factious. The law must be respected by all, and especially by those who, under the vain pretext of defending a religious liberty *whose founders and apostles we are*, and of which they are the worst enemies, pretend to obey only a foreign sovereignty, refusing to bow before the sovereignty of their country."² We must not forget, however, that for a moment after the first enforcements of the decrees against the "non-authorized" teaching orders, there seemed to be promised an escape from the storm. The superiors of the afflicted communities had sent to the government a declaration couched in very moderate terms and approved by the French episcopate; and Grévy, supported by Freycinet, then President of the Council, had manifested a disposition to be contented with that declaration. The debates on this subject occupied the cabinet on September 16, 17 and 18, and precisely on those days the Grand-Orient was in session. The consequence of this coin-

¹ The *Chaîne d'Union* published this conference in June, 1880, as "worthy of the highest praise." ² *Chaîne d'Union*, 1880, p. 237.

cidence was narrated by the *Moniteur Universel* on September 22: "One of the Masons of the Convent (of the Grand-Orient) was told last Saturday about the negotiations which M. de Freycinet had held with the Vatican concerning the declaration emitted by the religious orders. He replied: 'If the President of the Council has negotiated with the Pope, he will leave the cabinet.' And on the next day, as the Mason had foretold, M. de Freycinet was forced to resign his portfolio." On September 23 a new cabinet was formed and Jules Ferry was constituted its head. The war against everything religious continued. The Sisters of Charity were expelled from the hospitals. A law establishing divorce was introduced in the Chamber. Cemeteries were secularized. It was proposed to subject seminarians to military service. Public religious processions were prohibited. New laws were enacted for the purpose of concentrating more thoroughly all instruction of youth in the hands of the State. The enforcement of the Ferry laws, primarily directed against the Jesuits, but applied also to the other orders whose members devoted themselves to teaching, was an occasion for the most revolting abuses of the governmental authority; in many instances even the honor of the army was compromised by its use in the sieges of convents and monasteries.

Under the influence of the emotions excited by these scandals, many French Catholics were then disposed to find fault with Pope Leo XIII. on account of his silence in the premises, and many blamed the Pontiff for his sympathy with, if not his instigation of the conciliatory declaration emitted by the superiors of the persecuted communities. But we must remember that from the very beginning of the anti-Catholic campaign undertaken by the Third Republic, the Holy See had realized that the circumstances were such as called for a persistent exercise of the patient prudence which is the most salient characteristic of the Roman Curia. And let us remember also, with one of the most judicious of the critics of the pontificate of Leo XIII.,¹ that His Holiness had deemed it wise to abstain from any demonstration which might have compromised the interests of the Church in France by throwing obstacles in the way of the relatively conciliatory advances which Freycinet seemed to be ready to make. But the Pontiff had emitted his complaints and protests in a diplomatic manner, and he was about to repeat them in a more solemn style when there appeared the semi-official proposition in regard to the declaration of the religious superiors. As for that document, well observes T'Serclaes, "there was no reason for disapproving it; not only did it contain nothing contrary to prin-

¹ T'SERCLAES; "Pope Leo XIII.: His Life, His Religious, Political and Social Acts." Paris, 1894.

ciple, but it gave rise to a hope that the persecution would terminate. When these anticipations failed of realization, and when the Pontiff perceived that reticence was no longer a duty, he issued his eloquent letter to Cardinal Guibert, dated October 22, 1880." In this letter Leo XIII. gave great praise to the conduct of the French Catholics, both clerical and secular, and he lauded the heroism of the hundreds of French magistrates who had abandoned their positions rather than execute the decrees of the persecutors. In reference to the declaration of the superiors, the Pontiff reminded the superlatively zealous among the Catholics that it ought to be sufficient for them to know that "the declaration had been prepared by the authority, by the instigation, or at least by the permission of their bishops." Then the Pontiff recalled, for the benefit of the zealots, the principles on which the permissibility of the declaration was based; that is, the well-understood fact that the Church is opposed to no form of government—that the Church seeks only the good of religion in all of her relations with the civil power. "No one can deny," added His Holiness, "that in all things which are not unjust the powers that exist are to be obeyed, so that there may result a preservation of the order which is the source of public security." The Pontiff was careful to observe, however, that from what he had presented as the duty of Catholics toward the republican government of France, "it did not follow that in obeying the existing powers, they should necessarily approve whatever might be wrong in the constitution or administration of the government."

On March 28, 1882, there was promulgated a law concerning primary instruction which rendered that instruction obligatory in the case of all children who were between six and thirteen years of age; but the instruction was not necessarily to be received in the institutions of the State—a privilege which favored, of course, only those Catholics whose pecuniary condition enabled them to patronize the private schools which received no subsidies from the government. During the discussion of this law in the Senate the innate love of justice animating Jules Simon, ultra-radical though he was, impelled him to move an amendment to the effect that the children in the State schools should be taught "their duties to God and to their country;" but Schœlcher, the president of the commission charged with the examination of the law, exclaimed: "I cannot accept that amendment, as I am an atheist." The Catholics of the smaller towns and villages often succeeded in partially obviating the curse of the prohibition of religious instruction in their public schools, since the Municipal Councils enjoyed the right of naming the School Commissioners, and frequently they appointed ecclesiastics as such members. The cabinet of Freycinet was replaced

during seven months by one organized by Duclerc; and Duvaux, its Minister of Public Instruction, was apparently content with what his predecessors had effected to the detriment of the Church. But on February 21, 1883, President Grévy assigned to Ferry the task of forming a new Ministry, and of course the champion priest-eater hastened to resume his favorite occupation. Here we would note that as a Minister of Public Instruction, Ferry was animated by strange notions concerning the moral needs of the daughters of France. Whereas most of the giants of his school ever desired that their wives and daughters should be religious women, Ferry took care, when reorganizing the Normal School for Girls at Versailles, not only to appoint as president a Protestant (the widow of Jules Favre), but also to give the chair of moral science to Joseph Fabre, a notorious and rampant infidel. This Fabre, the trainer of so many of the future wives and mothers of France, wrote in his *Elements of Philosophy*: "Morality can and ought to be taught independently of any idea of a God. . . . The contrary doctrine would justify the poisoning of Socrates; it would renew the great scandal of the cross of Jesus; it would exalt Nero and Domitian; it would rekindle the pyre of Giordano Bruno; it would repeat the horrors of St. Bartholomew's Day. . . . The pretended demonstrations of the existence of God are insufficient."

Ferry signalized his advent to power by depriving innumerable pastors of their "salaries," merely because informers, often notorious liars, had denounced them as violators of unjust laws. The cross was torn from the gates of the cemeteries of Paris and in many of the other large cities. Since the Masonic designs were often thwarted by the "undue" moderation of some magistrates in their application or interpretation of the persecuting enactments, Ferry engineered through the Chamber a law which suspended the irremovability of the judges for three months; and immediately their office was taken from all the magistrates whose integrity and independence gave umbrage to the lodges. More than six hundred magistrates were thus dismissed. During 1884 the ecclesiastical budget, never too large, since it was equal to about the half of one per cent. on the value of the property stolen from the Church, was greatly diminished, the Chapter of Saint-Denis was suppressed, and the allowances of the Archbishop of Paris and of many other prelates were reduced to derisory amounts. The year 1885 witnessed no new persecutions other than the withdrawal of "salaries" from some hundreds of pastors, who were accused of influencing their voting parishioners at the previous elections. In 1886, however, the work of the Educational League was completed. We have seen that the Ferry laws of 1879 banished all members of religious organizations

from the teaching staff of the secondary and superior schools. It remained for Paul Bert to deliver what was perhaps the most effective of all blows against Catholicism in France, by means of an elaborate bill which completely laicized primary education. Bert had always frankly avowed his object. During the discussion on the Ferry projects in 1879 he had been appointed to draw up a report for a commission which rejoiced in such members as the Masonic luminaries, Louis Blanc, Lockroy, Lacretelle, Constans, Spuller, Floquet and Duvaux. In this report he had said: "Instruction must be laic, *exclusively laic*; no teacher can be taken from among the members of any religious association, whether that association be authorized or not. . . . The commissioners have not wished to trouble themselves, as legislators, with the eternal disputes of metaphysicians (on such subjects as God, the immortality of the soul, etc.) . . . We have concerned ourselves principally with the discipline of intelligence, being sure that when natural science has taught the child how to observe; when physical science has taught him how to prove; when mathematical science has taught him how to draw consequences; we will have formed a mind which will be free from prejudices and one which will not be easily seduced by sorceries and superstitions. By the study of natural phenomena the child will be superior to foolish terrors and to unworthy credulities (such as belief in future punishment for sin.) . . . He will never hope for a sudden miracle to cure the evils of society, any more than he would look for it to cure his physical maladies. The saviors will never seduce him." When Bert's bill on primary education had been presented to the Deputies, such orators as the Count de Mun, Lamarzelle and Mgr. Freppel combatted it most vigorously, and as a last resort endeavored to draw some of its poison by apposite amendments; but the Chamber passed the measure as the lodges had drafted it. It was modified but slightly by the Senate; and when it was promulgated on October 30, 1886, it was found that all members of religious communities were to disappear from the primary schools, just as they had already been expelled from the others. Such was the remedy which Bert and his brethren prescribed for a society which was afflicted with the disease of Catholicism. Article vii. had been rejected, but the Bertian substitute was a preventative, according to its author, "against the phylloxera of modern society." Therefore it was that at a banquet given by the General Council of Yonne, Bert offered the toast: "I drink to the inventor who gave us the sulphate of carbon to banish the phylloxera of the vine, and I drink also to the framer of that Article vii., which would banish the phylloxera of Catholicism."

Having given a succinct account of the chief causes which have

contributed to render the name of the Third French Republic so distressing to the ears of all faithful children of the Spouse of Christ, we would request the attention of the reader to the Encyclical *No-bilissima Gallorum Gens*, which Pope Leo XIII. issued in June, 1884—a document which portrays the history of the relations between the Holy See and France during the previous few years, which recapitulates in a most solemn manner the evils inflicted on the Church by those who now guide the destinies of the Eldest Daughter of the Church, and which indicates the causes of those evils and assigns their remedies. Naturally the Pontiff begins by reminding the world of the Christian glories which have pre-eminently distinguished France; of praises which, more than any other nation, France has received from the Sovereign Pontiffs; of the gifts which France has received from God in the natural order; and then His Holiness laments that “sometimes France has forgotten herself and has neglected the duties which God imposed on her.” However, the Pontiff consolingly remarks: “France has never given herself entirely to such madness, nor has she forgotten herself for a long time.” But now, we are reminded, in the entire extent of Christendom there circulates the poison of wicked doctrine—a doctrine which aims at the complete destruction of every Christian institution, and in France the evil presents itself in the guise of a heterodox philosophy which has given birth to a spirit of immoderate liberty and *in the form of a secret society which has sworn the death of Catholicism*. The Pope insists that “no State can be prosperous when virtue and religion languish;” for without the idea of God authority and law lose their force, governments become tyrannies, the governed become rebels—such are the consequences of a forgetfulness of God. Again, unless society has recourse to God, its Protector, it cannot hope for His blessing. History demonstrates this fact, and most especially is the fact shown by the history of France during the last hundred years. Then the Father of Christendom shows how for the family, the basis of society, it is necessary that a Christian education be given to the child, and how it has been on account of this necessity that the Church has always condemned the theory of a “neutral” education. Uninfluenced by a belief in a God who is Creator, Rewarder and Punisher, the young will never bend beneath a rule that commands even a decent life; habituated to a refusal of nothing to their passions, the young will easily be a source of trouble to the State. Thenceforward confining his reflections more especially to the needs of the State, the Pontiff reminds us that among men there are two societies which are thoroughly independent, each in its own sphere. These societies are the spiritual and the temporal; but we must not forget that there are certain “mixed mat-

ters" in which each of these societies naturally has an interest, and concerning a regulation of which they must come to an agreement. This need was understood in France by the civil authorities, after the subsidence of the revolutionary turmoils in the beginning of the nineteenth century; and therefore the two powers, spiritual and temporal, agreed on that Concordat, in which Pope Pius VII. condescended to such an extent in favor of the French Government. The results were happy, both for the Church in a revival of the Christian conditions, and for the State in the receipt of a promise of tranquillity. Such a result, remarks His Holiness, is much to be desired in these days of revolutionary enterprise; now, more than at any other time, the State ought to ask for the beneficent intervention of the Church. Nevertheless, the Head of the Church is compelled to admit that the acts of the French Government are now of such a nature that they indicate an imminent rupture of the Concordat; and he calls attention to his letters to the Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris in reference to the persecution of the religious orders, as well as to his letter to President Grévy on the general hostility of the Republic to the Church. Then the Pope praises the courage of the French bishops in the present circumstances, and he especially commends their efforts for the establishment of Catholic schools, despite the enormous revenues of the governmental establishments, against which they must contend. He repels as a calumny the Masonic assertion that these efforts prove that the bishops are enemies of France; he insists that when the prelates champion the interests of souls, they simply perform their duty. And the Pontiff grows warm in his commendations of the zealous and charitable French priesthood, as well as in his acknowledgment of the heroic courage of so many of the French laity. On June 27 Leo XIII. addressed a brief to the Bishop of Perpignan, accentuating the counsels given in this Encyclical, and especially deploring the political divisions among the French Catholic laymen—divisions which prevented their presenting a united front at the polls, where they might destroy the Masonic hydra which was strangling France. The so-much-needed union, says the Pontiff, will easily be consummated if Frenchmen will seek their motives in the Encyclicals issued by Pius IX. and by himself, but especially in the *Syllabus* promulgated by his predecessor. "Let Frenchmen do away with disputes, the objects of which are merely private interests—interests which are of secondary importance when compared with matters which belong to a more elevated order."

It has been well said that the history of the modern European Revolution is but one enormous lie; and one perpetual hypocrisy; and certainly the record of the dissension between the Church and

the Third French Republic does not indicate that the latter institution is an exception. Mendacity and hypocrisy were needed, indeed, for the assertion that the persecuting decrees of Ferry, Bert, etc., were merely actuations of "existing laws." The most honest among the Liberals of France manifested their disgust toward this hypocrisy. Laboulaye cried: "They exhume the edicts of the olden kings, the decrees of the Reign of Terror, those of the Cæsars, etc. . . . All is acceptable to the democrats when they desire to strangle liberty or to hunt the 'Jesuits.' As for those ordinances which recognized liberty of conscience, freedom of teaching, the right of association, all these do not exist, according to our democrats. 'All for them; nothing for any others;' but especially 'nothing for religion'—that is their war-cry." And the injustice of such procedures caused Jules Simon, the most learned and otherwise most eminent man in the Republican party of France, to thus apostrophize the majority of his brethren: "To-day the republicans imitate the adversaries whom they once combatted; it seems to me that when they attain to power, they have learned only how to proscribe. . . . Do not make us say that whenever liberty troubles you, you do not love it. You do not love liberty unless you are willing that your adversaries should enjoy it. If you love liberty for yourselves alone, you do not love it; you do not know its meaning; you are unworthy of understanding it."¹ It was an easy task for two veritable luminaries of French jurisprudence, M. Rousse, of Paris, and M. de Demolombe, of Caen, to demonstrate in two masterly juridical *Consultations* on the decrees of March 29, 1880, that the plea of those decrees being founded on "existing laws" was a cowardly hypocrisy; and their declaration was endorsed by more than two thousand lawyers, among whom were all of the most illustrious and most disinterested members of the French bar and magistracy.² Certainly the Masonic conspirators against the Church could not have trusted greatly in any "existing laws" when they devised their new Article vii.; and it was only when the Senate had rejected that article as too despotic, that men were informed of those "existing laws"—ordinances which "existed" with so little vitality that, in order to give any force to them, two new decrees were made as substitutes for the condemned article. In their search after "existing laws" which might crush the "clericals," the democratic despots raked among that past which they continually cursed. They seized on all the

¹ It was this plea for true liberty that made Jules Simon an object of detestation to his Masonic comrades. Smarting under their ingratitude, he said: "It is we who are defending the Republic—we who are trying to preserve it from the stain of despotism; and it is precisely because of that effort that we are, I will not say discussed, but reviled and outraged." ² RIVAUX; "Cours d'Histoire Ecclesiastique," vol. III., p. 674. Paris, 1883.

arbitrary decrees and violent measures of the two Napoleons, and hailed them as proper chastisements for the slaves of Rome; thus, as some one wrote at the time, presenting a picture of "Democracy licking the mud from the boots of the Empire." They even stirred up the debris of the royalist Restoration, which they anathematized with a bitterness which did not animate their curses against the two Empires, hoping to find their hatred justified by the acts of a government which they absurdly proclaimed as "clerical." They found a number of ordinances which were hostile to freedom of education, and which the Universitarian monopoly and the threats of revolutionary Liberalism had extorted from the feeble Louis XVIII. and Charles X.; and with these testimonies they essayed to convince the world that even the government of the Restoration, "clerical" though it was, had for its own safety been compelled to restrain the "Jesuits." The lie was so barefaced, remarks a judicious historian,¹ that it might be considered a wicked pleasantry, a revolutionary *gaminerie*. "For the Revolution was wont to amuse itself with its victims; we all know the little chant sung by the cannibals in the Café de Foy at the Palais Royal while they squeezed the blood from the heart of Berthier and then drank it: 'There can be no feast, if the heart is absent.'" The task of the Masonic persecutors was easy when they peered into the pile of documents bequeathed to France by the men who had travestied all that was good in the Principles of 1789. Here they were rewarded by the discovery of laws which were not only sanguinary, but more despotic and irreligious than any which Satan had as yet ever breathed into the mind of man. Certainly these records, stained with the blood which, as Taine remarked, "is the soul of the Revolution," ought to have satisfied the seekers of "existing laws;" but they must needs recur to the philosophic, Masonic and Jansenistic parliaments of the eighteenth century. "These democrats," reflects Paul Féval, "experience no shame in donning the old ducal wig of Choiseul, the favorite and accomplice of the Pompadour. They applaud loudly the judicial crimes of those parliaments now styled by history 'the parliaments of Choiseul-Pompadour;' and they are happy in being able to imitate and to resuscitate those despots of the robe." When a similar enterprise, but one projected on a smaller scale, was essayed in 1825, it was no more moderate anti-clerical than Pierre Leroux, who said: "That man does not understand liberty who demands an execution of the olden parliamentary decrees against the Jesuits; I shall say more—he himself is guilty of Jesuitism." Of course, having whetted their appetites with the morsels dragged from the graves of the Second Empire, the Restoration, Napoleon I., the Revolution and

¹ RIVAUX; loc. cit., p. 677.

Louis XV., the democrats of the Third Republic hastened to regale themselves with the drippings from the caldron of Gallicanism, as it had been prepared during the reign of Louis XIV. Undoubtedly these gentry had no more accurate idea of the meaning of Gallicanism than that which is entertained by ninety-nine per cent. of our Protestant scholars; but they knew that Gallicanism had been used by the Grand Monarch as an engine of war against certain temporal claims of Rome, and therefore they determined to imitate a sovereign whom they especially abhorred. Then we heard of dragoons being directed against harmless old men of prayer, and against convents of consecrated virgins, whose sole defense was the crucifix. Then we read of the siege of the Abbey of Frigolet, so bravely conducted by a republican general. Before these scenes were witnessed, that serious republican, Dufaure, had declared in full Senate: "In the programme openly displayed by an eminent republican deputy, a distinguished orator of the Chamber, I find that there are projected against the Catholics all of the measures indicated in those edicts of Louis XIV. which accompanied or followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes." Commenting on an appropriation of weapons from a Gallicanism which his comrades could not comprehend, Jules Simon said: "The Most Christian King had at least an excuse in his faith; but you, who represent free thought, and who therefore do not claim to be the sole depositaries of absolute truth, you cannot pretend to share in a doctrinal unity. It will be said of you that you use repression for the sake of negation." But Paul Bert, the champion of the Third Republic in its deliberate contempt of logic, did not quail before this arraignment by Jules Simon. With phenomenal cynicism he accepted the allegation: "Yes; *we are the negation*. Protestantism, Jansenism, all other heresies, are merely partial negations, half-measures of days long vanished. We are a negation which is total and radical." And then, as though he had heard St. Augustine's cry: "Catholicism is integral truth," that is, a real and total *affirmation*, Bert added: "The question between us (the Church and the Third Republic) is one of life and death." No wonder that Gambetta felt that he was justified in proclaiming: "Clericalism is our enemy."

REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM.

IN the dialogue of Plato which is named after Timæus, an adept in the system of philosophy and astronomy held by the disciples of Pythagoras, the author sets forth his views as to the nature of the universe—views which were founded upon a belief in the nebular theory and the gradual evolution of the material universe from an original formless, irregular and disorderly mass. But before beginning the exposition of his thesis Timæus speaks in the following words to Socrates: “All men, Socrates, who have any degree of right feeling do this at the beginning of every enterprise, great or small—they always call upon the gods. And we, too, who are going to discourse of the nature of the universe, whether created or uncreated, if we be not altogether out of our wits, must invoke and pray the gods and goddesses that we may say all things in a manner pleasing to them and consistent with ourselves.” What a contrast to many modern books of science. They deal with the marvelous works of God without the slightest reference to the Deity. Rather is it not the fashion to speak of Nature, to personify her, to write her with a capital N, to descant on her marvels, to utter rhapsodies in her honor? And verily it would not be befitting that we Christians should need to be taught our duty in this respect by the very pagans. And so before we enter upon any discussion of that sublimest of all speculations in the domain of natural science, as to the mode in which God Almighty formed the system which is controlled and governed by the sun, we make our act of acknowledgment and faith in Him as Creator and Ruler of the heavens and earth and all things contained therein, and taking the words of Timæus, we make our invocation to the One True God, “to which I add an exhortation to myself that I may set forth this high argument in the manner which will be most intelligible to you and will most accord with my own intent.”¹

Had He so willed, God might have created the sun and the members of our planetary system in the state in which they are at present, and in which, so far as observation goes, they have existed throughout the whole period of historical time. But a universal tradition has existed even in the earliest ages of culture and civilization that the world, meaning by that generic term our system of worlds with their central sun, was formed from primeval elements which were scattered without order or disposition throughout the

¹ The Dialogues of Plato, translated by Jowett. Vol. II., p. 523.

firmament. "Chaos" is the term used by some classical writers, indicative of primitive confusion and disorder. Lucretius had even advanced a theory of the clashing together of atoms to account for the gradual aggregation of the parts of the sun, earth, moon and stars. The same tradition is to be found among the Christian writers and doctors of the earlier centuries. According to this tradition, which appears among many others in the writings of Athenagoras, St. Hippolytus, St. Theophilus, St. Basil, St. Ephrem and St. Ambrose, matter was originally created in an elementary state, and, moreover, this informal mass was one and not multiple. Even Origen and his school and St. Augustine agree on this point with the writers above named. Again, we have almost perfect accord among these Christian writers from Tatian to Hugh of St. Victor, and through Peter Lombard to St. Bonaventure, that the sun, moon and stars were all at first parts of this universally diffused mass.¹ The exposition of these views as given in the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa is most remarkable. In fact, he appears to have forestalled Laplace by fifteen centuries in the central idea of his cosmogony, which is the formation of the solar system from a diffused mass of primitive nebular matter. Had he possessed the knowledge gained by astronomical observations in the intervening years, his subtle mind might have even worked out the details of the theory. The hypothesis, as we now know it, seems to have been independently broadened by Kant at the end of the last century, and by Laplace in his "*Système du Monde*," likewise published in Paris in 1796. The facts on which the theory is founded may be thus summarized. The orbits or paths of the planets round the sun are all nearly circular, and all again lie nearly in one and the same plane. There is, moreover, a regular progression both in the distance of the planets from the sun, with but one exception, and in their density on either side of the planet Saturn, which is the least dense of all. Again, the plane of rotation of each planet on its axis very nearly coincides with its plane of revolution round the sun, and the direction of revolution and of spin are also in the same sense—in that namely which is opposed to the direction of motion of the hands of a watch. The satellites, again, of the various planets in revolving round their respective primaries share this common direction of motion, and their planes of revolution are almost coincident with the planes of revolution of the planets. Identity, then, of direction of motion and of plane in which the motion takes place is a remarkable feature of the solar system. The probability that this is due to a common cause and not to mere accident or chance is overwhelming, and has been computed to be as about four million to one.

¹ *Origine du Monde d'après la tradition*, par l'Abbe Motaïs.

With these facts before him, Laplace supposed that the whole of the space at present occupied by the solar system was originally filled by a primitive nebula in the form of a cloud of intensely heated gas, hotter even than the sun is now. The different portions of this nebula had in the beginning diverse motions of their own, but each and every particle of matter mutually attracting and being attracted, the formless mass of independently moving atoms finally resolved itself into an immense globe of highly rarefied gas, with a motion of rotation about a central axis. Such a rotation would inevitably result in a flattening at the poles in the gaseous globe, and the ultimate form would be that of a lens-shaped nebula. The gas was at first expanded by heat, but condensation took place, owing to radiation at its surface, with a consequent quickening of the speed of rotation according to a well-known mechanical law. Successively the edges of the lenticular mass ceased to be continuous with the parent mass, and so in turn were abandoned as rings. Laplace appealed to the instance of the planet Saturn and his rings as a proof of his hypothesis. We may remark, however, that had the rings of the nebula remained as near to the condensing and revolving primal mass as the rings of Saturn are to their putative parent, within a distance the limits of which can be calculated according to laws first enunciated by M. Roche, a distinguished French mathematician, in the year 1848, they could have continued to exist without coalescing in the form of rings of discrete particles of matter. The rings, however, as imagined by Laplace would after a time break into fragments, and their materials would be swept together into globes, revolving in all cases—so thought the author of the theory—though this universality of common direction of motion is not absolutely necessary or likely in the same sense as the mass out of which they had been formed. The same process would be applicable to the newly formed and highly attenuated gaseous globes, which would themselves in their turn become the parents of their moons. The example of the rings of Saturn seems to have suggested to Laplace the idea as to the origin of the planets and satellites. These rings, however, as Clerk Maxwell has demonstrated, are composed of a myriad of meteorites, a truth which has been spectroscopically confirmed by Professor Keeler at the Lick Observatory. We have already stated that rings so close to a primary as Saturn's rings are would be torn to pieces by the tidal forces due to the planet and would never be aggregated into moons.

We are not concerned to defend the hypothesis of Laplace in its entirety, for as, among other critics, M. Faye, the learned author of the excellent little book, "*L'Origine du Monde*,"¹ has shown, it

¹ Paris, 1884.

needs modification in several particulars. Since Laplace, however, broached his theory two most potent instruments of research have been placed in the hands of the astronomer—the spectroscope, not yet fifty years old, and the photographic plate, which was not fully introduced as an adjunct to the telescope and spectroscope until the year of a total solar eclipse, visible in India, namely, in 1868. The observations which have been amassed by means of these instruments have greatly strengthened the probability of the truth of the theory. The telescope had revealed the existence of nebulous masses in the heavens, and even as early in the century as the year 1811 the observations of that giant among observers, Sir William Herschel, had led him to adopt the view that nebulæ were transmuted into stars by a gradual process. For the materials that he had collected in his scrutiny of the starry firmament fell naturally into several broad divisions or classes, and so he advances from faint and different nebulæ to nebulæ in which a centre of condensation is barely visible, and thence to nebulæ in which the nucleus becomes a point of star-like brilliancy. An easy transition leads to nebulous stars or stars which are surrounded by an atmosphere of nebulous light, and hence to masses of stars involved in nebulous matter, and so by way of diffused clusters he arrives at length at rich star clusters. And photography, which has brought to light by means of long-exposed plates objects which the most powerful telescope yet built could not unaided show, has in the main amply confirmed the generalizations of Herschel and the theory of Laplace. We have but to turn over the pages of the volume in which Dr. Roberts has gathered together specimens of his truly marvelous photographs of “Stars, Star-clusters, and Nebulæ,” or to examine the photographs produced by Professor Barnard at the Lick Observatory, or that exquisitely beautiful series which has been secured by Mr. Wilson, to have it borne in irresistibly upon the mind that we are not looking at a collection of disjointed pictures, but at representations of objects which merge gradually one into the other, until we arrive at last at the group or cluster of finished stars. Not that the process of formation has been along one line only, for the pictures show that the ways in which systems of worlds have been formed are evidently diverse and various. The special nebulæ, for instance, which form a kind of celestial whirlpool seemingly form stars along the trend of the luminous whirls which start from a centre of condensation, as is evidenced, for example, by the beautiful photographs of the spiral in the constellation Canes Venatici. Dr. Roberts has recently brought into juxtaposition four pictures of such spiral nebulæ and four other pictures of star clusters, which are most suggestive. In the latter plates the nebulous streams of the former

photographs are replaced by clusters of stars which almost exactly pick out the paths of pre-existing spirals. Smudge the stars and the nebulous hazy spirals would be reproduced. Yet, again, the many instances of rings and discs of cloud-like luminosity—as, for example, the nebula in Perseus, or that in Andromeda (New General Catalogue, 891), or the famous ring nebula in Lyra, with its brilliant central star-like condensation surrounded by a thick ring of light, or the great nebula in Andromeda, with its central mass encircled by a system of rings, or the wonderful nebula in the constellation Cetus, with a stellar nucleus and broad nebulous ring full of strong condensations, apparently forming into stars, or yet again a nebula in the Great Bear, which has a dense stellar nucleus, apparently bear witness to the process of star formation as imagined by Laplace, as actually taking place in the heavens. How delighted would the distinguished Frenchman have been could he but have seen Dr. Roberts' photograph of the great nebula in Andromeda, an object which can only just be glimpsed by the naked eye, and the rings of which not even the excellent drawings made by Bond by means of a powerful telescope had succeeded in showing. Then, again, we have the so-called "Dumb-bell" nebula in the constellation Vulpecula, seemingly condensing into a globular cluster of stars, while the process is advanced a stage further in the cluster in Lyra, which is numbered 56 in the catalogue of Messier. There the globe of stars has condensed around a central nebulosity, nebulae and stars being intermingled. The beautiful cluster in Hercules, so well photographed by Mr. Wilson, is yet a further example of this same mode of formation. And if we seek for nebulae which are merely diffused whisps of luminosity without any structure, presumably the primeval form of all, let us look at the nebulae in the Pleiades, or the "Crab" in Taurus, or the gigantic streaks of gauze-like matter which stretch through Cygnus, or yet again the brilliant, foam-like masses that surround Antares and the star γ Scorpii, or the dense clouds about η Argus, as shown in the pictures by Dr. Gill, Professor Bailey and Professor Barnard.

By means of the fine nebula in "Orion," so often photographed by Draper, Conuvas, Roberts, Wilson and others, we can advance yet a further step. For in its structure and in its position with regard to its axis it bears a striking resemblance to the characteristic forms of the solar corona which are seen at times of total solar eclipse. So that to the argument drawn from the pictured processes of formation of stars from nebulae we have in addition an argument from similarity in structure between the external solar atmosphere and the furthest appendages of the nebula. How like, too, are comets' tails to whisps of nebulous matter; and a comet

was seen in the outer parts of the corona of the eclipse of 1882 and 1893. Is it possible that comets are the refuse of the celestial workshop which wander aimlessly through space until they are captured and bound in invisible links by the attraction of some mighty sun or planet?

Laplace imagined the primitive nebula to be a mass of highly heated gas. Spectroscopic observations have confirmed his hypothesis as far as the gaseous nature of the nebulae is concerned, and Sir William Huggins, who was the pioneer in this branch of work, regards the characteristic lines of the spectra of nebulae, which are bright thin lines, as indicating a high temperature in the gaseous structures. This reading of the spectrum is, however, contested by Sir Norman Lockyer, who would see in nebulae immense aggregations of meteors which on account of innumerable collisions are surrounded by a gaseous atmosphere. The nebulae, according to this view, are relatively cool, as compared with many stars. Such a nebula in which the gaseous particles are magnified into stones or liquid drops is dynamically a possibility, and could have been transformed into solid globes according to the investigations of Professor George Darwin. The weight of astronomical opinion seems, however, to incline towards the supposition of the highly heated gaseous nature of the nebulae. But the point which is of the greatest weight as lending countenance to the hypothesis of the gradual evolution of suns from nebulae is that whether the nebulae be hot or cold there is a well marked and connected graduation in the spectrum of the heavenly bodies from the nebulae to finished suns like our own. Very soon after the spectroscope had been applied to the study of the stars, Father Secchi proposed a distribution of these bodies according to five well marked types. In the first type he placed stars like Sirius and Vega, which yield spectra crossed by the hydrogen lines, which are much broader in these stars than in the solar spectrum. Besides these characteristic lines of hydrogen a few faint lines due to other substances appear. The second type, which embraces nearly all the other lucid stars, and in which our sun finds its place, is characterized by numerous lines due to metals in addition to the hydrogen lines. The third type contains stars in which the line spectrum is replaced in the main by a spectrum due to bands, the atmospheres of these suns being at a lower temperature than those of the first and second types. The star α Herculis is probably the best example of this type. The bands are very sharp and dark at the extremity, which is towards the violet end of the spectrum, and become more diffuse and fainter towards the red. In the fourth type are the red stars, which presumably are merely glowing in the firmament before utter

extinction. Their relative coldness is indicated by their spectra, which contain broad bands, but shaded in the opposite direction to the bands in the third type of spectra. A further possible indication of their moribund condition is to be found in the fact that no bright stars belong to this type or class of spectra. To a fifth type Secchi relegated all stars which like γ Cassiopeiæ give a spectrum of bright lines. Modifications of this scheme of division have been suggested by Voget, by Pickering and by Lockyer. The last named, beginning with a relatively cool nebula, would arrange his materials on an ascending and a descending scale, according to their presumed temperatures, the highest place being occupied by his Group No. 4, which corresponds to Secchi's Type I. However, Secchi's types for all practical purposes of classification are still sufficient, provided that his classes are sub-divided to show more markedly the transitions in the different varieties of the characteristic general type. Such a plan has been adopted with great success by Dr. Frank McClean in his recently published admirable memoirs on the spectra of all the stars down to the $3\frac{1}{2}$ magnitude,¹ and a series of star spectra secured by Father Sidgreaves at the Stonyhurst College Observatory shows the transition stages exceedingly well. Following Dr. McClean, therefore, we may arrange the spectra in the following order:

First, the nebulae which give a spectrum of bright lines due to hydrogen and of the gas helium from cleveite. Next three divisions of Secchi's Type I., the first of which includes the stars which are characterized by the dark lines of hydrogen and cleveite gas, and which, as they follow in their distribution in the sky the zones which are occupied by the nebulae, are presumably in the first stage of development from the nebulae. These stars are particularly thick in the region of the Milky Way, especially in its southern portion. Is it possible that, as Dr. McClean suggests, the "Galaxy itself is composed of clouds of isolated and extended nebulae, each studded with its quota of helium stars, both large and small, in the first stage of development?" It is noteworthy in this connection that the ninety-two stars so far known of Secchi's Type I. which contain bright lines, and which, therefore, are supposed to be at a high temperature, are confined, as Pickering has shown, to the Milky Way and to the similar structures in the southern heavens known as the Magellanic Clouds.¹ To return, however, to McClean's sub-divisions of Secchi's types. The lines of oxygen next put in an appearance, and they only disappear with their helium companions to give place to lines due to calcium, barium

¹ Comparative Photographic Spectra of Stars to the $3\frac{1}{2}$ Magnitude. Phil. Trans. R. S. Series A. Vol. 191. (1893.) The Spectra of Southern Stars. London, Stamford. (1898.

² Astronomy and Astro-Physics. Vol. viii. No. 4. November, 1898. P. 232.

and magnesium. We thus have two further sub-divisions of the first division of Secchi's Type I. In Division II. are the serium stars, or stars showing the strong hydrogen lines. Helium is now altogether absent, and calcium is distinctly less strong than hydrogen. Calcium asserts itself, however, in Division III., as, for instance, in such stars as Procyon, in which it is characterized by a line as strong as any due to hydrogen. We are thus led up gradually to the solar stars, and thence to the banded spectra ofness which belongs to the last type of spectra.

the class of α Herculis, and to the final stage of redness and dim-

But whatever classification we adopt, this salient fact remains that there is an undoubted merging of the spectrum of one class of stars into another, and that the spectra of the stars are connected with the spectra of the nebulæ. In the case of the stars in the trapezium of the nebula of Orion, Sir William Huggins' photographs of the spectra show that the bright lines characteristic of the nebula are not confined to the nebulous region alone, but extend to the stars involved in the nebula also, thus showing a physical connection between the stars and the gaseous materials of the nebula. Nor can it be argued that this is an isolated case, and that the nebulæ must be so immeasurably more distant from us than the stars that it is impossible for the stars projected upon them to have anything more than an optical connection with them. Even had we not the evidence of the photographs of the nebulæ, and the aggregations and condensations formed in them to guide us, Keeler has actually detected by means of the spectroscope velocities in our line of sight in the case of several planetary nebulæ. Hence it follows that their distances, great as they undoubtedly are from us, are comparable with the distances of the stars.

A further argument for the probability of the truth of the theory of star formation as imagined by Laplace is to be found in the fact that it squares most admirably with the only feasible hypothesis as to the maintenance of the solar heat which has so far been broached, that namely which is due to Helmholtz and Lord Kelvin. According to this view the stores of solar heat which are being continually poured forth by the sun are maintained by the gradual contraction of the gaseous ball of the sun towards his centre under the force of gravity, which is resisted, and hence the heat radiated into space by the force of expansion due to his great temperature. In the process he becomes more and more dense. There was a time then when, as a mass of highly attenuated matter, he extended very far indeed beyond his present boundaries, a time, in fact, some twenty million years ago, when he was a nebula.

For all these reasons, then, it seems to be highly probable that

stars and suns are formed out of *nebulæ*, and that at least in its main propositions the mode of formation imagined by Laplace is a possibility. But even so we must fain admit, in the words of Sir Robert Ball, that the theory "is emphatically a speculation; it cannot be demonstrated by observation or established by mathematical calculation."¹ The whole matter may well be summed up in the words of Professor Newcomb: "At the present time we can only say that the nebular hypothesis is indicated by the general tendencies of the laws of nature; that it has not been proved to be inconsistent with any fact; that it is almost a necessary consequence of the only theory by which we can account for the origin and conservation of the sun's heat; but that it rests on the assumption that this conservation is to be explained by the laws of nature as we now see them in operation. Should any one be skeptical as to the sufficiency of these laws to account for the present state of things, science can furnish no evidence strong enough to overthrow his doubts until the sun shall be found growing smaller by actual measurement, or the nebula be actually seen to condense into stars and systems."²

A. L. CORTIE, S. J.

¹ *Ency. Brit.*, 9th edition, 1888. Vol. xvii., pp. 310, etc. ² *Popular Astronomy*, p. 515.

THE PEACE OF THE WORLD.

SURELY it is not only the pessimist who suspects a faint echo in the wind to-day of the ancient cry of the Prophet Jeremias, "Saying—Peace, peace: and there was no peace." On the 18th of May the representatives of the great war lords of the earth, having in their company the agents of a number of smaller wights, who, because they have most to fear from war, must of necessity stand well with the warriors, met at The Hague to discuss the ways and means of peace. On the 29th of July they closed their sessions with the issue of a protocol, the terms of which were partially signed and subscribed to, embodying the results of their deliberations. This contains three declarations and three conventions, all of the former and two of the latter distinctly facilitating war by making it less repulsive to the human mind, and only one convention making in any way for peace, and that weakly, by creating an optional board of arbitration as a possible means of avoiding war. At the outset the European press viewed the scheme as insincere upon the part of its authors and Quixotic on the part of its friends. The ground of this view as alleged was pretty much the same as that attributed to the false criers of peace by the prophet of old. "For from the least of them even to the greatest all are given to covetousness," saith the prophet: and it was stipulated in the preliminaries of the gathering that no question should be raised of territorial rights or *claims*. It was not unwisely said by Lord Russell of Killowen, at a public meeting in support of the conference: "One further consideration prevented our being too sanguine of immediate beneficial results. It was this: On what basis could the conference proceed? With a map of the world before it, marking existing territorial lines? Would it be accepted as a basis of future action in Africa, in China, in Asia and even in Europe or America? I fear not." At the conclusion of the conference the American press gave way a bit to jubilation, chiefly because whatever good was to be hoped out of the first convention concerning arbitration was in large measure due to the American delegates.

It would be stupid to deny all good outcome to the meeting of so many able men representing so many peoples and interests in council for common good, or to the possibilities of international arbitration; but it would be unwise to be too sanguine of practical results in the scheme of optional arbitration. Yet there is a cir-

cumstance in connection with the conference to which prudent men the world over have adverted, to wit, the exclusion of the Sovereign Pontiff from representation at The Hague, which has certainly injured its own influence, while putting a slight upon one who is universally recognized as the chief representative of peace upon this earth. The most seriously influential daily newspaper in the United States does not hesitate to insinuate its recognition that a peace conference from which the Pope is absent is almost a contradiction in terms. And Mr. Stead, erratic as his genius is, surely represents more English opinion than his own when he writes that it is practically impossible to get on with the peace problem while ignoring "the one Sovereign in Europe, a spiritual Sovereign, whose voice is more potent for peace and war than that of almost any other territorial sovereign."

The facts in the matter seem to be these. The original annunciatory rescript of the Tsar of Russia was transmitted to the Sovereign Pontiff at the same time that it was communicated to the governments of the earth, and was answered by His Holiness with the most cordial encouragement and promise of support. Then the Italian Government, either because it considered any reception of the Prisoner of the Vatican among the sovereign powers as an imputation against the legitimacy or menace against the security of its own sovereignty or because it anticipated that the Papal delegates would seek and find a means of raising the question in the conference of the indefeasible right of the Roman Pontiff to his temporal power, protested that were Leo XIII. invited to participate in the conference, Italy must decline to take part. Italy's withdrawal might not mean much, but Italy's protest, when backed by two or even one of the other great powers, jeopardized the very existence of the conference. So in the end the Pope was not invited to send any representative to The Hague.

This was a serious mistake. Historically, from the days when Leo the Great, alone and unaided, invested only with the majesty of his high office, turned back Attila and his Huns and so saved Western civilization from utter obliteration, down to our own time, when Leo XIII. became arbiter between Germany and Spain in the matter of the Caroline Islands, the Roman Pontiffs have been the champions of peace and the most potent factor for its preservation known to diplomat or potentate. It was in the early part of this century that, in a conference of the Powers, Prince Metternich announced to the Ministers of England and France "that the Cabinets of Austria, Prussia and Russia, wishing to exhaust every means of reconciliation before having recourse to force, came to fix their attention on a new step tending to bring about the intervention of the Holy

Father as mediator in the measures to be taken in regard to the actual state of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies." It is instructive to recall from the joint note of the Powers on this occasion, addressed to Cardinal Consalvi as representative of the Holy See, the following sentences: "Not doubting that your Lordship honors their determinations with his support and that his wishes desire the success of their enterprise, the allied courts are equally convinced that His Holiness, in his exalted wisdom, will lend his co-öperation to the accomplishment of the work of peace which they propose to consummate and to strengthen in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. . . . The Cabinets will not indicate the mode of intervention of His Holiness nor here mark out the means which he ought to employ for the success of the mission which a unanimous confidence entrusts to him." This note was followed by a personal communication on the same matter from the Tsar of Russia, Alexander I., which opened impressively with the words: "I am always ready to testify to your Holiness the veneration I bear for your exalted virtues and for the august character of the power with which you are invested. Your Holiness will find in the service I am about to ask of you a proof of the same sentiments, of the confidence with which your sagacity inspires me and which on just grounds I place in your sublime authority." These words will serve to confirm the very obvious statement that the nations of the earth have recognized and still do recognize the majesty of the Sovereign Pontiff, his potent influence for good and the fact that, though despoiled of his patrimony and of that small tithe of territory and temporal subjects which would fill up the technicality of kingship, his authority over the minds of men is vaster than that of all human monarchs combined.

By a little reflection we may see the application of this authority to the present problem. In any federation of the world, whether partial or total, the different nations which would be its units may be compared to the families or individuals who are the units of any civil state, and an examination of the workings of courts of justice in securing domestic peace will throw light upon the possibilities of an international board of arbitration as the guardian of the peace of the world. There are two possible sources of domestic discord: doubt about individual rights, where the right is uncertain, or each of two individuals thinks the right is on his side and neither is willing to surrender or compromise; and, secondly, the unrighteous acts of claims of the wicked. With a machinery established, possessing the confidence of the people as a whole for the determination of uncertain right and for the vindication of law against the iniquitous, and with an executive strong enough to enforce recourse to

such tribunals and to carry out its decrees and sanction law, we have practical means, though limited, for securing domestic tranquillity. But to retain such a state of affairs there are several requisites. We must have a people sufficiently enlightened and of sufficient good will to desire, establish and retain such an order of things, and sufficient individual good conscience to keep the relative number of the wicked small. Force alone never made a man virtuous, nor could court or police restrain the disorder if the vast majority of the people went over to unrighteous ways. Hence profound statesmanship always looks to the enlightenment of the public mind and the elevation of the public conscience. Moreover, there must be something approaching unanimity of conviction about the aim of civil society. However rank heresy it may sound to-day, it is true that the purpose of civil society is not by right the increase of national wealth and power, no more than it is the enriching of the individual or the enlarging of his power. If we are all to be given over to covetousness, then we shall cry "Peace, peace," and there will be no peace.

Now in like fashion to make an international board of arbitration possible, we must have the majority of the people in each nation—for when all is said under any form of government to-day, the majority of the people, if of any considerable strength, will make its desires felt in the councils and transactions of State—desiring only justice, and that through the medium of such a tribunal and with confidence in the tribunal, because assured that it is so constituted as to work only for justice. Secondly, we must have executive force sufficient to sanction its decisions against the recalcitrant, and the deliberate workers of injustice must be kept in a decided minority. This is all a case of universal public enlightenment and public conscience, to be accomplished only by the enlightenment of the mind of the individual and the elevation of his conscience. To-day not all of the nations of the earth want only justice. I do not mean to emphasize in that statement the great Powers who excluded territorial claims from discussion in the conference, and who limited the work of the international arbiters to certain restricted matters, who look yet to the partition of China, of Africa, of Turkey and of heaven knows what else. But there are others, semi-barbarous or wilful, who do not aspire to the white robes of the saints until they are done with the realty of the world. This marks a field for work upon the human conscience. Some, too, while just enough in their desires, may not care to secure justice by any such tribunal, because of the sacrifice of national independence entailed thereby, preferring untrammelled liberty to peace and justice by any such concession. There is room there for a little ethical development in the dis-

crimination between liberty from oppression and independence of all unnecessary coercion, and liberty from all restraint and independence of all law. Peace in Commonwealths is only attained by the surrender of some individual liberty to the protection of law, and international peace will necessitate the concession of some national independence to the supreme law for the sake of universal good order. Furthermore, all the tribes of the world will want representation upon this new judicial bench, and in a measure they will have it; and a method has been devised aiming at the best results by having the members of the court appointed by the highest authority in the judiciary of each of the represented nations. But will that be satisfactory to the more enlightened? Shall we be satisfied to have our interests in the hands of the highest form of judicial integrity produced by China, Turkey, Persia or Siam? One suspects not. How can that be mended? Only by a further civilization of the doubtful lands, which will result in a higher platform of right and wrong. A matter of conscience again.

Furthermore, to consider arbitration as proposed, it is doubtful whether nations will often wish to recur to this optional tribunal. At home, where we think to consider arbitration native, what has become of our boards of arbitration for labor and strikes? We knew the public mind was not ripe for coercive arbitration, so we have tried a voluntary type. With what result? That the stronger party has uniformly declared that it had nothing to arbitrate, or in a few instances where compromise was thought advisable, the parties preferred to deal directly with one another. The fact is the questions resolved themselves not into a matter of right and wrong, but of common pecuniary interest. Internationally, similar results are probable. The United States maintained that it had nothing to arbitrate in the matter of the Maine explosion. It to-day maintains the same with regard to the Alaskan boundary. England is sure that she has nothing to arbitrate in Africa, and we are at present waiting in daily expectation of the crackle of machine guns in the Transvaal. We ourselves having assumed that the obedience of a whole people, who are in large numbers better educated than the average European, for a consideration of twenty millions of dollars paid to their former masters, could be transferred without their consent to our authority, are now settling the matter by the arbitrament of arms. To use voluntary arbitration supposes a high and delicate sense of right and wrong and a brave determination to be always right at any cost. Conscience again.

Lastly, what is to become of the recalcitrant—of those who, appealing to the court and distrusting the integrity of its motives and dissatisfied with the justice of its decision—shall refuse to abide by

the same? They must be coerced. Yes, but that means war. Some coercion, it is true, and therefore some application of force, will be necessary among the nations, even as there must be police work—and sometimes militia work—in the maintenance of domestic peace; but it should be reduced to a minimum, and the most potent element of reduction will be from the proper moulding of conscience in the individual and thence in the nation.

There has been frequent reference in the universal discussion of our peace problem to an appeal to public opinion, to an education of public opinion. Now what are we to understand by public opinion? Surely not the ephemeral conviction or clamor produced by an aggressive newspaper syndicate, a public opinion which would give color of truth to the Californians dubbing our Spanish difficulty as Willy Hearst's war, or justify Kinglake in attributing the Crimean War, the most senseless of modern conflicts, to the agitation of the *London Times*. Not a public opinion created by a political canvass which persuades by motive of pecuniary advantage or political power. No; but a public opinion which is but the outward expression of a lasting state of conscience based upon principles of truth and right firmly grasped from reason and revelation. There is no use of maundering over the influence of mere secular education and material civilization wrought by the almighty influence of the common school, emasculated by the elimination of religious principle and distraught by the pedagogical vagaries thrust upon them by too enterprising school-book publishers. There never was a single savage civilized without Christianity as the means of his elevation, nor a single child brought up to a high degree of moral integrity without the direct influence of religious principle. The history of the world puts the former statement out of the arena of disputation, and the latter, though still under dispute, has only one side to it for the calm, experienced, unprejudiced judicial observer.

If, then, the chances of peace are dependent upon an educated conscience, what unspeakable folly it was not to make place for the Sovereign Pontiff in the discussions of the Peace Conference! The war lords with battles just over, now on, and others pending, survey the commercial, manufacturing and agricultural advantages of peace in possession. The Teacher of right and wrong to one hundred millions of loyal Catholic consciences the world over (whether the non-Catholic world likes it or not) is left to meditate upon the shortsightedness of selfish men. These millions of people are being moulded by an efficacious and far-reaching machinery of an organized body to the highest canons of divinely revealed truth and justice, and that body is directed by the untrammelled guidance of one aged and venerable Prince at Rome, and those millions are obedi-

ently listening for his authoritative voice. He has directly and fearlessly attacked the live problems of our time and by a series of encyclical utterances marked out the lines of security and equity for capital and labor, for sovereign and subject, of law and of freedom, of truth and of error. In every doubt he is their court of last appeal; in every matter of conscience they bow to his arbitrament. In the face of larger though less righteous liberties, or independence broader though less secure, in despite of argument, contempt, ridicule, material disadvantage and the menace of the sword, they have been loyal and they will be loyal. Instead of lessening in numbers, they are increasing; instead of weakening in the courage of their convictions, they have grown more brave. In the State of Connecticut alone two-thirds of all the children born last year were baptized in the Roman Catholic Church.

Had the Peace Conference issued any word that should be of counsel to the human race signed by the representative of the Holy See, one-fifteenth part of mankind distributed at points of vantage throughout the world would have studied to make it a matter of conscience to support the right. Nor is this all. For thousands who are not Roman Catholics receive with respect for their wisdom and security the moral counsels of the Sovereign Pontiff. Seated apart from the battles, the competition, the rivalry and the ambitions of a world struggling for material spoils, the calm judicial mind of Leo XIII. is a tower of strength for those who look for equity of judgment and correctness of principle in all the ethical doubts that beset the mightiest and the least of men. Moreover, his missionaries are busy in all far lands, from Alaska to New Zealand and round the whole belt of the globe, in raising the savage and the semi-civilized barbarian to a plane where world-citizenship is possible because Christian principles and practices are acquired. The sword has never made a man of its conquest, but at most a trembling, treacherous and immoral serf. The unchristian East Indian, however docile or apt a soldier he may be, is no fit subject for voice in the federation of the world. The South American Indian has not gone forward, but back, since the breaking up of the Catholic missions. The North American Indian *secularly* civilized has no help to offer us save in his own extermination. That seems a cruel thing to say, but it is the *arrière pensée* of practical statesmen. Non-Catholic foreign missions I wish to say nothing unkind of, but the indictment brought by Mr. Shearman, in an address to the New York Board of Foreign Missions, of the results of missionary efforts in the Hawaiian Islands are not very encouraging to one who hopes for citizenship among the natives of Hawaii.

So when all is said, not only the main hope, but the absolutely essential means to the peace of the world is the influence of the Holy

Father in forming public opinion based upon public consciousness of right and loyalty thereto. He is the only one capable of forming and sustaining sound ecumenical public opinion, which is what the wise and the practical look to for the achievement of permanent universal peace. If there is a difficulty in recognizing the Pope in any international conference because he is not a temporal Sovereign, it is but an argument why he should have his temporal kingdom and have it at once. If the difficulty be otherwise insuperable, let the Powers restore his temporal sovereignty to him at once. The Powers are not insensible to their own insufficiency without the help of the Sovereign Pontiff, and it is not surprising that at the closing session of the conference at The Hague, immediately after Jonkheer van Karnebeek, of Holland, had announced the signing of the different conventions and declarations by the respective representatives, Secretary Van Ris read a letter written by Queen Wilhelmina asking the Pope for his moral help in the humane work of the conference, and then read the reply of His Holiness, stating that he now, as ever, considered it his duty to promote all humanitarian and Christian purposes, and expressing his best wishes for the success of the labors of the conference. And here the press reports curiously add that the action of the Queen was loudly applauded. By what intuition the applause at that moment could be discerned as only for the action of the Queen and not for that of the Pontiff likewise, is another press mystery. When we do our duty lamely, tardily and reluctantly, there is a tendency to save our own pride by a half protest that it is from magnanimity and not from a sense of duty that our action proceeds.

None the less the Holy Father will coöperate promptly and effaciously. The preparation of an encyclical on the subject is already announced and will be shortly forthcoming. But while His Holiness will do his best to promote the world's peace, he can never forget that there is no peace possible without Christ, and no justice sure without a Christian conscience, and no conscience safe except when directed and safeguarded by that Vicar whom He has appointed to teach revealed truth and right to all nations and to every creature. He has already voiced his judgment of the inseparability of this as of any sane form of civilization from true Christianity, when, at a reception of the Cardinals on April 11, he said in reference to the then approaching Peace Conference: "Our thoughts turn to an act which we have anticipated by our desire and which sheds a consoling ray upon the closing century. This act, which aims at rendering more rare and less bloody appeals to the sword, paves the way for a calmer social life. There is a mission which, in the history of civilization, will glorify him who took the initi-

ative in it. We hailed it with joy, and we raise our prayers that the exalted intentions of its originator may bear abundant and general fruits. May Heaven show the way to a solution of the differences pending between nations, by purely moral and pacific forces. The Church desires nothing more deeply. As the mother of nations, as the enemy of violence and the shedding of blood, she is charged with a mission of pacification, not only in the domain of conscience, but also in the public and social sphere. This mission the Church fulfils in proportion with the freedom left to her action. Every time she has intervened directly in the serious affairs of the world the Church has assured the public welfare, and the Popes have often put a stop to oppressions, secured truces, agreements, treaties of peace. Civilization would have perished without the Papal authority, which time and again vindicated the supremacy of right over might. Remember Alexander III. and Legnano, Pius V. and Lepanto. Oppressions may now and again embarrass and curtail the powers of religion, but, amid all these vicissitudes, the Church pursues her beneficent mission, which embraces heaven and earth. Pure humanitarianism could not assure real and lasting prosperity. The endeavor is even now again perceptible to withdraw civilization from the influence of Christianity."

CHARLES MACKSEY, S. J.

THE FOUNDATION OF ÆSTHETICS.

IN what does Beauty consist? It is a question which cannot fail to interest us, for we are all conscious that in the Beautiful, both in nature and art, we have a manifestation of something more perfect and more true than what falls under our common experience. The function of the artist and the poet is not simply to affect our senses agreeably and raise in us the æsthetic thrill. They are men whose vision pierces deeper into the sphere of reality than does ours, who see the perfect through the veil of the imperfect, and the eternal through the temporal, and to whom it is given to reveal what they themselves have seen. Nor is it without justice that Mr. A. J. Balfour urges it as a fatal objection against the philosophy of naturalism that it provides us with no adequate explanation of our ideas of the Beautiful. We scarcely need any further argument to assure us of the falsity of a theory which tells us that the only reason why music delights us is that the crude sounds with which it first began were connected with certain pleasant occasions in the lives of our ape-like ancestors, and that a state of things is perfectly conceivable in which the cackling of a hen-yard should be more beautiful than the compositions of Beethoven. Even before we are able to give any direct reason for our belief, we are certain that the works of the great masters claim our admiration in virtue of an intrinsic excellence and because they approach to some ideal standard.

Nor is it only because it reveals to us glimpses of a more perfect order of things that we are naturally drawn to enquire into the true meaning of Beauty, but also because the art of any period is a sure index of the inmost character of the men of that age. The cathedrals of the fourteenth century speak to us of the faith of that epoch, the Renaissance style reveals to us no less clearly the neo-paganism of a later day. We ourselves are leaving behind us the impress of our own minds in the style of the present time. Consequently as long as men love to scan the records of the past in order to trace the history of human character, so long will the nature of the Beautiful be a favorite subject of philosophic enquiry.

It will help us to discover what really constitutes Beauty if we ask ourselves what effect the contemplation of it has upon us. We could scarcely hesitate to reply that its natural effect is to excite our love. And our answer is in accord with the unanimous verdict of nearly all the world's greatest thinkers. We may perhaps be

allowed to quote two striking testimonies from antiquity. "Wisdom," Plato tells us in the *Phædrus*, "cannot be seen with the eyes; for her beauty would have filled us with unspeakable love had there been a visible image of her." So also, seven centuries later, S. Augustine writes: "Tell me, I pray, is it possible for us to love aught except what is beautiful?" But indeed it is hardly necessary for us to go back so far. Lines with which we are all familiar express the same truth:

"O happy living things! No tongue
Their beauty might declare,
A spring of love gushed from my heart,
And I blessed them unaware."

To determine with accuracy the nature of this love which we feel towards the Beautiful is a point of paramount importance. For there are two kinds of love which spring from totally different sources, though in actual life the motives of our affection are often so mingled that it is impossible to say how much flows from one source and how much from the other. We can, perhaps, best explain our meaning by an example. Let us suppose two men each to have purchased a house in the midst of the lovely scenery of the Yorkshire dales, and each to be delighted with his purchase. One is a man whose pleasure lies solely in the scene before him. The other finds his satisfaction in the fact that his house is fitted up with all the most modern appliances for comfort, and that it is within easy reach of the city where his fortune was made and where his interests are still centred. Here we have instances both of the higher and the lower love. The latter has no regard whatever to the intrinsic perfection of its object, for its sole motive lies in the power which that object possesses of conferring some pleasure or advantage on the person who feels it. In the case I have supposed the retired merchant would not care in the least if the building of some hideous factory marred the whole beauty of his purchase; he might even feel pride in it as an index of the prosperity of his county. On the other hand, his neighbor's whole delight in the place would be destroyed; for its *raison d'être* lay in the perfection of the landscape and in that alone. Such was the love which the Ancient Mariner felt when he saw the fairy-like loveliness of the water-snakes; such in a very different degree is the enthusiasm we feel when we read of any of the heroic deeds which light up the pages of history.

It might perhaps seem as though we were wrong in dignifying the lower love by so exalted a name. Yet it is impossible to deny it a title to be called love merely because it is selfish. In both cases we find that strong attraction towards the object which is the essential characteristic of love. And even in the higher love

there is an element which if not selfish in the usual sense of that word, is at least self-regarding. Love must seek its own satisfaction, and even if its satisfaction lies not in any advantage to be gained, but simply in the contemplation of its object, it is impossible to exclude the self-regarding element altogether. Indeed, as we have already said, in life the higher and the lower love are generally found in combination; for instance, the love which a child feels for its parents and which makes every child believe that his own father is at once the wisest and the best man living is not solely motivated by reverence and admiration, but contains also a sense of favors to come. The same may be said of our religious feelings; although we may not be able to say in the concrete where one begins and the other ends, we can have no hesitation in affirming the existence of two elements in our love to God, which are as different as the oxygen and the hydrogen that unite to compose water.

Which of these two kinds of affection is it of which Plato and S. Augustine speak when they tell us that affection is the natural result of the sight of the beautiful? We reply at once that it is the higher and not the lower love of which they speak. No power of satisfying some desire and so conferring pleasure would be a ground for attributing beauty to any object. The sounds of the tom-tom possess no inherent loveliness because they stir the scantily-clad African to wild delight. To be beautiful an object does not need to be of any utility to us, but it must fulfil the conditions requisite to awake in us the higher love; in other words, it must possess its own proper perfection. And in this answer we have a clue to the true characteristic of beauty. It lies in the intrinsic perfection of the object.

Let me, however, guard myself against the ambiguity contained in this word "perfection." For evidently it can be used in more senses than one; and while we should all allow that a perfect horse was necessarily a thing of beauty, a perfect cab-horse can scarcely lay claim to the title. The reason is that in the first case perfection expresses the possession of the excellence which is proper to the nature of the horse; in the second case it merely means that the object spoken of has all that is needed to enable it to fulfil the external end to which we wish to put it. In this sense we apply the term to the commonest things. But when applied to beauty it of course has no reference to any external aim, and expresses only the possession in the fullest degree of the excellence which belongs to the nature of the object.

We may illustrate this by an appeal to experience. We all of us realize the beauty of the gayer butterflies which flutter from flower to flower in summer, of the "red admiral" or of the "clouded-

yellow;" but the common white butterfly fails to attract our attention. Why is this, except that whilst the former sorts strike us as being perfect in their kind, the latter seems to us as but an ordinary type? But we have only got to note the white butterfly more carefully to observe how soft is the down upon its wings, how delicate its shading, to recognize that it, too, is wonderfully perfect, and in consequence wonderfully beautiful.

There is, however, a feature in the love with which the sight of the beautiful inspires us which must not be overlooked. It is not that which consists in the aspiration after something which we do not possess. It is the love of fruition or union; it is what we commonly term joy or delight. These two phases of love—aspiration and fruition—may be paralleled by the power of the magnet to attract steel: it not only draws the steel towards it, but holds it united to it. The objects of our love exercise a similar influence. They first draw us towards them, and since their attractive power is in no way exhausted by this, they bind us in a close union to them. In the case of the beautiful we enjoy this union from the first; the delight of fruition enters at once into the soul. The means by which we enjoy it is, as experience tells us, contemplation; and the more profoundly our contemplation penetrates and realizes the perfections of the object, the deeper grows our love and our delight. Any one who enters the Turner collection in the National Gallery at London is conscious of the beauty of that master's works; but only the trained artist realizes what a treasury of perfections each picture is.

The conclusion at which we have arrived, that beauty consists in the intrinsic perfection of the object, allows us to decide another point of no little moment. It is that beauty is perceived by the mind, and the mind alone. By this I do not mean to say that the senses take no part in the perception of the beautiful. To maintain this would, of course, be absurd, and we shall shortly see what is the part which they play. My contention is simply that the knowledge of beauty as such is outside their sphere. For it is only the intellect which can understand what perfections are proper to any object. It is the intellect which considers any class and sees which things fall below the type of that class and which realize the perfections of the type in their fullness. The senses could not see in the Gothic arch the lightness and the spring—if we may use the word—which constitute a large part of its superiority over the Norman. There is nothing in a line engraving which is calculated to give special pleasure to the sense. Yet common consent allows to line engraving a high place among the arts.

The senses can tell us nothing of the perfection of an object, for they speak to us only of what is pleasant to them themselves. The eye delights in light; the ear in sweet sounds. But this pleasure is purely subjective. The sense of sight cannot tell us whether the bright color which gratifies it is a perfection or not in the object viewed. So we find that children will always like the bright color for its own sake. It is not till the powers of reflection have developed that we can judge whether or not the color is appropriate, whether in fact it is "in good taste." There is a passage in Burke's *Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful* which bears on this subject and which I quote all the more willingly because his view of the nature of Beauty differs so widely from that maintained here. He says: "Wherever disposition, where decorum, where congruity are concerned I am convinced that (in taste) the understanding operates, and nothing else, and its operation is in reality far from being always sudden, or when it is sudden it is often far from being right."

So little indeed has sense to do with the perception of Beauty that there are only two of our senses—those of sight and hearing—the objects of which are capable of being termed beautiful. It is only by a conscious misapplication of terms that we can say that a thing tastes beautiful or smells beautiful. And the reason that this prerogative falls to the lot of the senses of sight and hearing is that these two minister in an especial manner to the mind, while the others are more purely physical in their use. This argument from our current modes of speech, though at first sight it may seem trivial, is in reality of no little weight. Long before men have begun to discuss problems of philosophy, the language which they use forms a philosophy for them. It testifies to the way in which, by the very nature of things, they view the world around them, and is a true witness because the laws of the intellect are the handiwork of God. If beauty had been something of which the sense takes cognizance, why should it be found impossible in any language to apply the word to the objects of taste, touch and smell? If it is not the object of the reasoning intellect, why do we call not only what we hear and see, but also a heroic deed or a self-sacrificing life beautiful?

The same conclusion is strengthened if we approach our subject from a different point of view and consider what are the special characteristics which render any object beautiful. The scholastic philosophers tell us that there are three requisites—proportion, integrity or the absence of all curtailment, and resplendence—*Proportio, Integritas, Claritas*. I am not concerned to show that no other assignment of its essential constitutives could have been

made, but mention their opinion, since I believe that on reflection it will be recognized that these do in the main sum up what is required to confer the charm of beauty on an object. For the moment we may defer the consideration of resplendence, as it will best be treated of when we come to speak of the manner in which the senses aid us in æsthetic perception. But the part played by proportion and integrity is plain enough. It is proportion which gives us in a picture the harmony of color, the due relation of the various parts to each other and the subordination of them all to one end; in poetry it gives us metre and rhyme; and how entirely music depends on it is testified by the appropriation of the word harmony to that art. It is the absence of proportion which would displease us if we were to see a Hebrew prophet represented with the features of an Apollo. However beautiful the sculptured face might be in itself, we should feel that there was a lack of harmony between the character to be represented and the representation given us by the artist. With regard to integrity, it is evident at once that the least curtailment of any part impairs the beauty of the work of art. How much charm is lost to the Laocoön by the diminutive figures of the two sons! How many masterpieces of Greek sculpture, the perfection of whose lines cannot be equaled at the present day, have by some insignificant mutilation lost nearly all their attractiveness except to the practised eye of the artist whose imagination is able to restore what they have lost! If a bust does not fall under the condemnation of this canon it is solely because the human head possesses a certain completeness in itself so that we are not conscious of any deficiency in representation. But it is not owing to mere fashion that we enjoy the sight of a fine bust, while we should turn with dislike from a figure which represented half the human form.

Now, both these characteristics can be perceived by the mind and by the mind alone. The mere sense could never experience any repugnance to an incomplete figure or to a statue that was unduly diminutive, nor could sight, apart from reflection, tell us aught of the harmony of the colors in a sunset, or appreciate the manner in which Vandyke's portraits appeal to us like the characters in a great drama.

What then is the part which we are to assign to the senses in the perception of beauty? The question is easily answered if we remember that however great be the intrinsic perfection of an object, there is one condition which must be satisfied if it is to appear beautiful to us. We must know it not in a vague or abstract manner; but it must either have fallen under our own personal experience or be known to us in so clear and definite a way that we can represent it sensibly to our imagination as though it were

present to us. Without this it can have no more attractiveness for us than one of those chefs d'œuvre which are the glory of some foreign cathedrals, but which except on a few great festivals are covered with a curtain. Indeed even if we see the object, and there yet remain some impediment which hinders us from fully appreciating its qualities, the love which it excites in us is diminished in a like degree. Thus a slight obscurity of expression is sufficient to prevent many a noble passage of poetry from obtaining its due meed of admiration, and a defective ear may render us totally unappreciative of music.

Here then we find in what our dependence on the senses consists. For it is a law that all knowledge comes to us primarily through the senses; abstract ideas are only attained by analogies and comparisons, or in other words by the aid which the senses and the imagination can afford us. But to admit that this is the only road to human knowledge is tantamount to saying that it is the only road to human love. And this truth, as it seems almost unnecessary to point out, is most wonderfully illustrated in the Incarnation. This was the great appeal to the love of man, the supreme effort on the part of God to awake in all hearts the dormant fires of affection. And the means used were proportioned to the aim. He manifested Himself in a sensible form, and it is by His beauty as thus made known that He draws all hearts to Himself.

The need of this sensible manifestation is expressed by the third element mentioned above, resplendence. An object can only be called resplendent when its perfections are such as to compel attention, when they force themselves upon our notice, when they are clear to us with a clearness which our eyes can see and which seems in itself to confer a halo of beauty. It is this quality of resplendence that all are conscious of in such a picture as the *Madonna di San Sisto*. But in no other way than by an appeal to our senses or our imagination can the perfection of any object thus impress us.

There may, of course, be other kinds of beauty which do not need to appear in a sensible form. We may go further and affirm that there are such kinds of beauty. We ourselves recognize it when we talk of a beautiful life or of a beautiful character; for thereby we give an unconscious testimony that beauty is to be found in man's moral and spiritual nature, in that part of him in which the senses have no share. It is this spiritual beauty which belongs to the angels and to God. In this life we cannot perceive it, for we can only recognize the beautiful in its material veil; but we hope for the day when the veil will be no longer needed, and

we shall be able to gaze not merely on the shadow, but on the unclouded reality of beauty.

There is, however, a reflection which naturally suggests itself with regard to the comparatively small part played by the senses, and which might seem fatal to this view. It is that there are certain colors in nature, as, for instance, the blue of a southern sky, which are beautiful in themselves and to which it would be as unnatural to refuse the name as it would be to apply it to the objects of the senses of taste and smell. Yet it is hard to say that there is any intrinsic perfection in them apart from the pleasurable impression which they convey to the senses, or that proportion and integrity have any place in them. This is, of course, true. There are certain colors and certain sounds which may without exaggeration be called not merely pleasant but beautiful. Nor is the reason far to seek. There are certain objects between which and the sense which perceives them there is a natural harmony. Light in this way confers a pleasure on the eyes which dark and sombre colors cannot do. But it is only when the mind consciously or semi-consciously reflects on the admirable harmony which is found between the sense and its object that we conceive of light not simply as agreeable, but as beautiful. So even here we may claim that the principle that beauty can be only intellectually known is not violated, but on the contrary confirmed.

How, then, shall we define beauty? It is a bold thing to attempt to do when definitions have already been given by so many great authorities. But as we have stated clearly what we hold to be its most essential elements, to give a definition will not be doing more than what has already been ventured. It is clear that any definition framed must be understood to have reference to æsthetic beauty alone as distinguished from moral, since the beauty of man's spiritual actions can in this life be only dimly realized through the help of sensible analogies, and is in fact seen "through a glass, darkly." The two chief characteristics which we seem to have distinguished in it are the perfection of the object and its manifestation to us in an especially clear and evident manner. Our definition may, therefore, run thus—the luminous manifestation to the senses or the imagination of the intrinsic perfections of an object.

There is still one problem which we have hitherto left unsolved, namely, the reason for the love which we feel towards the Beautiful. Why should the mere contemplation of a fair landscape fill our hearts with delight? What cause is there that our nature should react to this stimulus? And, more noteworthy still, why should

our own characters be enabled by our power to appreciate the higher forms of beauty?

The answer to this question is to be sought in the nature of the human will. The will is always attracted by what appears to the mind to be good. This is a law as universal as the law of gravitation. It is the spring of all our action, good and bad men alike acting because their will adheres to what seems good. The difference between the two classes lies in this, that while the good aim at what is truly the best, the bad, fixing their attention on something lower, cherish the idea of it until it influences them. We may see something similar in art. We perhaps prefer a badly executed sketch by some one whom we love to a far more beautiful one by a stranger. It is not that we are incapable of appreciating their respective merits, but that we have diverted our attention from the intrinsic excellence of the picture to a relative goodness which it possesses for us. Where, however, there is nothing of this kind to influence our judgment, our will acts spontaneously; it feels the attractive force of any perfection which is sufficiently apparent and adheres to it; in other words, the ultimate reason of our love for the Beautiful is to be sought in our natural tendency to what is good. If there was question of something which we saw to be good, but the enjoyment of which depended on any action on our part, the will would set our faculties in motion to attain our end. But here the enjoyment of the good lies purely in the act of contemplation, and the only task before us is to contemplate the beauty before us and fathom its perfections as far as we are able. In the contemplation itself we find satisfaction and delight.

Fr. Jungmann, late professor at the University of Innsbrück, in his important work, "*Æsthetik*," puts forward a theory which while similar in many respects to the view which we have maintained, differs from it in certain particulars. A brief account of this theory may be of interest, for it draws attention to a special aspect of natural beauty which has at all times appealed forcibly to all whose temperament has anything of poetry in it. Fr. Jungmann, indeed, insists strongly that our love for beauty is due to our natural desire for perfection; but he considers that in this case the operative force is the attraction which that which constitutes our own perfection naturally exerts upon us. We look, he says, on the face of nature and there behold perfections which we recognize as similar to those which we may see realized in our own souls. What we admire in the surge as it dashes against the rocks is its vigor; the colors of the sunset delight us with their harmony; the landscape with its variety and ordered peace; the cliffs by their unchangeable stability. We cannot fail to love those things which seem as if

were to be allied to us and to mirror the secrets of our hearts; and even without formulating to ourselves why we thus delight in the contemplation of beauty, we find satisfaction in it and love it.

It certainly seems at first sight that the resemblance which we thus trace is a poet's fancy. But our author assures us that there is a far more intimate connection between nature and ourselves than that which is made by the work of the imagination; it is no mere play of fancy that we see a resemblance to ourselves in the lower forms of creation, for they are truly allied to us. Man is in a special way the image of God; but all other created beings are the work of the same hand, and throughout creation, though there is infinite variety, there is no contradiction, and the whole cosmic order is one great manifestation of the Divine character. In this unity of creation as declaring its author, Fr. Jungmann finds the justification of his theory. It is in response to a law of our inmost being that man is attracted to what is in fact the Divine image stamped upon the external world.

What we have already said will have shown that we cannot accept this view altogether. Our love, as we believe, is motivated solely by the perfection of the object considered in itself. Nor do we think that it is in any way essential that there should be any similarity between the perfections which we admire in it and such as we seek to realize in ourselves. But there can be no doubt that we do find a special delight in tracing resemblances between the spiritual and the material world, and though these similes be the work of the imagination, yet we are conscious of something deeper than the mere play of the fancy; they often possess the power to give us a new insight into some spiritual truth, to raise for a moment the veil which hides from our sight the unseen world.

We may perhaps be allowed to quote as an illustration of this the last three verses from Mr. Warren's "Lines written at Minthead:"

"One lesson still my spirit learned
 From flood and daylight fleeting past,
 And from its own strange self that yearned
 Like them to lapse into the vast,
 And merge and end its vague unrest
 In some wide ocean of the West;
 "Ere we can find true peace again,
 Our being must have second birth,
 Purged and made one through toil and pain
 With Him who rules and rounds the earth,
 Beyond the dark behind the light
 In mystery of the Infinite;
 "And we like rivers from their source,
 Through cloud and shine, by deep and shoal,
 Must follow that which draws our course
 The Love that is its guide and goal:
 Of life of death ye made me free
 Waters and hills of Severn Sea."

It is true that the poet has here invested a scene rich already in its own perfections with a new loveliness in making it symbolic of the course of the soul towards God. But he has, it seems to us, won a greater success than this; for he has shown us a glimpse of a beauty of a far higher order, the beauty of that spiritual world which, since the senses are unable to perceive it, cannot appeal to us unless through the imagery of the poet.

Naturally, we do not realize the beauty of the relation of the soul to God. But in those verses, which take us to the shores of the Severn and bid us watch the waters rolling on to the great deep, we discover what its loveliness is.

Here, then, as we believe, we have the explanation of the fact, which seems to have exercised so great an influence on Fr. Jungmann, that we are always striving to express natural beauty in terms of our spiritual experience, and to represent our inner life by symbolism drawn from nature. We are conscious within ourselves of an order of beauty other than that which lies without us, but we are unable to realize it or to imagine its true character. We are thus driven to embody it in an external symbolism, through which it may appeal to us, however inadequately. Indeed, this need under which we lie of interpreting our mental states by the aid of visible phenomena is true not only of the beautiful, but of the terrible as well. Thus in *King Lear* Shakespeare uses the battle of the elements to bring before us the terrific nature of the tempest in the king's mind. And on the other hand the world without, glorious as it is, lacks something: if we really believed that it was nothing but matter, the product of a merely mechanical evolution, it could not seem to us to be really perfect, for thought and mind would be lacking to it; it would be unable to move our love. We therefore bring the external world into close connection with our spiritual life, and looking on it through a medium which as it were transfigures it, find in it a charm and a beauty which would otherwise be wanting.

Yet while we do not hold that we perceive beauty because the same perfection which we delight in is found in our own nature, we are in full accord with Fr. Jungmann when he tells us that the material world is a revelation of the beauty of God. Many an incident in the lives of the saints shows us how at all times the holiest souls have delighted to find new manifestations of God's perfections in the wealth of beauty which He has scattered round us. It was this thought which inspired the well-known lines of S. Francis d'Assisi and caused S. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi to shed tears of joy at the sight of a flower.

The soul was created to seek God, and it is for this reason that

it is ever seeking the good, for it recognizes some reflection of His perfection in all that is good and is attracted towards it. Beauty is but one manner in which He who is infinitely perfect shows Himself to us, and though our mind may be fully occupied by the intrinsic perfection of the object, and may not find its way from the creature to the Creator, yet if its beauty were not derived from Him it would possess nothing for us to admire. Once viewed in this light, the material world no longer lacks the spiritual element of beauty, nor depends on our imagination for its possession, for even in its humblest forms it reveals to us the thought of God. Thus, too, we are able to justify that instinctive feeling common to all men, that the perception of beauty elevates and ennoble the soul. No sensualist account of the origin of our ideas of beauty could explain this; with such an origin beauty might perhaps please us, but it could do nothing to ennoble. But that its tendency really does exercise a purifying and ennobling effect on us is the unanimous testimony of the wise from the days of Plato to those of Wordsworth. The contemplation of what is fair, of "whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely" moulds us and influences us for good, as surely as the sordid surroundings of life in many of our great cities tend to deaden the imagination and to stunt the soul.

G. H. JOYCE, S. J.

Stonyhurst College.

THE CELTIC GROUNDWORK OF "THE INFERNO" AND DANTE'S PROTOTYPE.

IT is well known to students of the "Divina Commedia" that the poem did not spring from the brain of its author like Minerva from that of Jove, full-panoplied and full-grown. Mediæval literature is full of the rough-hewn materials which the Tuscan poet's genius, like a divinity in its action, shaped into an everlasting monument of thought. The genesis of the "Commedia" was somewhat akin to the formation of our own planetary system, according to the nebular hypothesis—a mere film of matter whirling wildly in space, gathering other particles and taking shape as it went, and at last emerging from chaos a magnificent and beautiful organism. Many

legends of visits to the world beyond our own had come down from early days, founded for the most part on the weird tradition of "St. Patrick's Purgatory." The most complete form of these quaint stories is found embodied in "The Golden Legend," and in Dante's day it was quite usual to have the story presented on the public stage in the popular form of religious drama called "Mystery." But there was a better defined groundwork for the "Inferno" still. It was handed down by Venerable Bede in his biography of the Irish culdee, St. Fursæus or Fursey.

If Shakespeare had been aware of the story of St. Fursey he would hardly have penned the line, "the undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveler returns," for the chief fact in this holy man's career was his death and restoration to life in a miraculous manner. Not only did he die, and then return to life, but this happened three times within the course of a few days. This may appear to some minds a staggering statement to make, but there is such convincing evidence of its truth to be relied on that no scholar versed in the literature of the early Irish Church entertains a shadow of doubt on the subject. Protestant scholars like Dean Reeves and the Rev. Baring-Gould have made their readers familiar with the wonderful story, but the best version of it is to be found in Sir Francis Palgrave's "History of Normandy and England." It was reduced to popular form so far back as the days of the Venerable Bede, who by commending a certain "little book" narrating the Saint's life proves that more than one biographer had already been at work on the wonderful story.

Here, then, was a man who had not only penetrated the secrets of the grave, but gave out, when his soul returned to its earthly envelope, what he had seen therein. Here, again, we find our gentle Shakespeare overdrawing the case when he makes the shade of the slain Danish King declare that "this eternal blazon must not be to ears of flesh and blood." Fursey's experience was more terrific even than the poet's fancy was able to conjure up. It was a tale, indeed, to harrow up the soul and make each particular hair to stand on end, if any utterance of human lips could effect such a marvel. And of its literal truth he brought back from the unseen world a living tangible proof of its horrors, in the shape of a hell-mark imprinted on his person by the arch-fiend. The demon whom the angel-guide of the Saint through the Shadow of Death had vanquished flung at him the form of a lost sinner from whom Fursey had accepted a gift in life, and the force of the blow left a burning scar on his cheek and another on his shoulder. These wounds, imprinted as with a searing iron, were seen to appear on the Saint's body as he lay in the swoon of death.

In this particular fact—a fact demonstrated and testified by so many indubitable witnesses that Venerable Bede and other chroniclers accept it unreservedly—we have a mystery of psychology and physiology more unfathomable than anything ever recorded before, save with regard to the post-mortem sojourn of the Saviour in the tomb. Flesh and spirit seemed to have been united in the flight of the Saint through the world of shadows, and yet the flesh was there, before the eyes of the watchers, though frozen in the chill of death. Here is a problem before which metaphysical speculation is paralyzed. St. Fursey's hell-brand, if one may without derogation so style the scars he bore from the conflict with Satan, is more wonderful in its way than even the stigmata of St. Francis or St. Catherine. Taking into review all the circumstances of the case, the episode is the most incomprehensible mystery, and at the same time the most convincing proof of the Divine power, even over the hosts of perdition, that ever was given to man.

Hence while Dante's rhapsody may aptly be described as a Vision, St. Fursey's revelation, which by many writers is also styled a Vision, bears the same relation to a picture of the mind as a dream does to the sleep-action of the somnambulist. It reveals a hidden link between body and spirit explicable only to the Divine intelligence, and shown to the world in order that its faith might be strengthened in proportion as its curiosity is left unsatisfied.

That it was with the Prince of the fallen angels himself the soul of the Saint had a conflict it is impossible to doubt. It was on the second night of his trance, if we may so term it, that the encounter took place. On the first night he had apparently died, with the words of a psalm on his lips. This was in the monastery at Rathmor, or Kill-Fursa as it is now styled—a cenobium which he had founded on an island in Lough Corrib. Around his couch were assembled his waiting and watching disciples and companions. When the veil of death, as they believed, had fallen upon his eyes he beheld four hands extended downwards, then four vast white wings spread out, and lifted by angelic arms he was borne away through spirit-space. Faces of indescribable beauty he now found his conductors bore, and presently he discerned a third angel, of dazzling mien, armed with shield and sword of blinding radiance, marshaling the way. The blessed trio, as they advanced, chanted in strains of glorious harmony the words of the prophet, "The saints shall advance from virtue to virtue, the God of gods shall be seen in Zion." Soon the music appeared to be caught up by myriads of voices, and as the travelers neared the throng the light became insupportable and the music overpowering in its sweetness

and immensity of volume, leaving only one definite line upon his spiritual ear: "They shall come out before the face of Christ."

He fain would have tarried forever in this entrancing gate of heaven, but the angels bore him back to earth with a promise that they would return. He awoke to find his friends standing disconsolate beside his pillow; he held his peace regarding what he had beheld, but, fortified by the Holy Sacrament, he awaited the promised return of the angelic visit.

Next evening, at the hour of tierce, the house being full of his kinsmen and followers, the numbness of death again fell upon his frame, and he became, to all outward semblance, a corpse. He had not spoken to any one of his previous experience, and those around him now gave him up as forever lost to earth. But his time had not as yet come. No sooner was the glaze of death upon his eyes than the same hands and faces that had greeted him before again presented themselves, and again was he borne with the swiftness of thought through the invisible spaces.

No obstacle had arisen in the course of the first journey, but in the second the spiritual wayfarers had to cleave their way through an intercepting host from the nether world. Why this was so is not attempted to be explained. We can only theorize on the analogous physical fact in meteorology, when the earth, after sailing many months in clear space, finds itself suddenly plunged into the midst of a dense stratum of meteorites and shooting stars. May not the vault of space be also occupied at times with clouds of malignant spirits, intent on evil to the souls of men?

In our present condition we can only speculate on this profound metaphysical theme, but limited as our knowledge of the laws of matter and spirit is, we have too many recorded instances of the influence of individual evil spirits upon mortals to doubt of their existence, though we may wonder at their audacity and the wide latitude allowed them in the working out of their fell designs. Let any one who doubts what St. Fursey said he saw, while his material eyes were closed, to all appearance, in death, recollect what is visible to his own eyes in the land of dreams. Our senses are for the time suspended, yet we see faces and objects and hear sounds and conversation, experience feelings of repugnance or pleasure in connection with those of whom we dream, exactly as we feel or have felt in our waking hours. This is a tangible fact, within the experience of every human adult; and we can no more explain it than we can the boundless phenomena of visible nature. Yet we have scoffing skeptics who, because they cannot seize hold of the unseen forces behind those things as they seize hold of chemical agencies and subject them to scientific material tests,

have the audacity to deny that there is anything behind the visible and tangible phenomena of nature and life.

We have here to note another significant difference between the creation of Dante's imagination and the actual record of a soul's experience, as furnished in the narrative of the Irish Saint. In the "*Divina Commedia*" the poet followed the archaic cosmography of Aristotle and the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, making his inferior world to correspond in configuration to the plan of a volcanic crater, with nine successive circles of punishment narrowing down to one central point of concentrated torture and eternal energy of punitive malice. The nine stages of beatitude, antithetically, ascend in gradually widening circles of honor and bliss until they embrace the whole extent of the universe beyond the fixed stars—the "*Primum Mobile*" or crystalline heaven where the angels and archangels, the cherubim and seraphim, God's mighty lieutenants, carry out His behests in the ordering of all things beneath and the music of the celestial choirs is perpetual.

Matters of cosmography and time measurement are existent only in the human mind. They are artificial arrangements, necessary to man and dependent on the planetary system of which this world of ours is taken as the centre. St. Fursey's spirit-flight took him beyond the bounds of the physical world. He was taken into a region wherein mathematical and astronomical terms lose their meaning. Hence, in his revelation we meet with no reference to anything touching on measurement or period or locality. We are led without explanation into a plane of spiritual life in which the laws which govern the mundane life are non-existent. This fact at once impresses the mind, and enables us to distinguish the work of the poetical fancy from the genuine utterance of an experience impressed upon the soul by means which could never be forgotten, so awful were they in their reality.

He describes the first contact with the outposts of the enemy as ushered in by horrible cries from the dark abyss. He could distinctly hear one of the demons summoning his companions to stop his progress and make war upon his angelic conductors. Then he beheld to the left of his path what seemed to be a great cloud rising from the deep, whirling and swaying as it ascended; and on looking closer found it to be composed of demoniac shapes twined in a writhing, confused mass. Presently this mass extended and began to assume the shape of embattled legions. The faces and forms of these infernal soldiers, he discerned on nearer approach, were most horrible to behold. They were not substantial, but seemed to melt into each other and pass through each other, as they flew hither and thither, as though they were only shadows or

exhalations. They flung themselves upon his angelic guides, but the warrior angel beat them off with his irresistible sword and his impenetrable white buckler. Then the leaders began to argue with the messengers of heaven. They began by saying that it was unjust on God's part to save sinners from doom, as it was written that "not only they who sin, but those who agree with sinners, are worthy of death." Many more things they urged, showing that they had a very intimate knowledge of the Saint's human imperfections in his earlier days. Several of the arguments used were taken literally from the words of the Gospel, such as—"Unless you be converted and live as little children, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." "This man," one demon added, "has by no means fulfilled that precept." To all these specious pleas the angel's almost invariable answer was, "He shall be judged before the Lord." To one of the demon's astute arguments he retorted with a query as to how Fursey had failed to observe his Master's behests. "He has accepted the gifts of the wicked, before they had given proof of their repentance," was the wily one's response. This had reference to the fact that the Saint had been bequeathed a garment by a man who was dying, and it was the form of this unfortunate being, who had been consigned to eternal perdition, which was hurled at Fursey, on his return journey, as the baffled demons retired from the conflict. It struck him, as he believed, on the shoulder, and his face also felt the impact of the cheek of the damned. The frightful contest was at last terminated by the arrival of the wayfarers at the celestial gates. The eyes of the Saint were transfixed with the glory of the outer circle of the Holy of Holies, and his soul was ravished with the divine melody of the sea of song which surged up from myriad angel voices. It was not given to him, however, to gaze upon the inner paradise, but from within came two glorified Irish saints, Meldan and Beoan, who bade him go back to earth and resume his labors for the reclamation of sinners. He was escorted back by the same angelic convoy, and on arriving at his monastery saw himself laid out as dead with his friends and brethren standing around his couch in sorrow and prayer. Their amazement at his return to life was beyond the power of words to express, and when he told of his experience and showed the marks of the fiend's attack, which remained with him, a burning reminder, until his death, they were simply stupefied. The matter was committed in full detail, as it fell from his lips, to writing. Twelve months afterward, on the anniversary of the same day, he was again stricken as by death, and again was he carried away to the abode of the blest. On this occasion he was directed to go abroad, to Britain and Gaul, and

preach Christ there. Twelve years, he was told, he was to have for this work, and so it turned out. He did as he was bidden, and the conversion of many thousand heathen in those lands was the fruit of his wonderful apostleship.

Fursey's first missionary efforts were spent in East Anglia. Sigebert II., the ruler of that territory in those days, was extremely anxious for the diffusion of Christianity and education among his uncouth and unskilful subjects. He had already secured the help of Felix the Burgundian and a staff of teachers from the famous monastery of Canterbury; and Felix, having been consecrated as Bishop, fixed his see at Dunwick. He found that the magnitude of the task presented to him required much more help; and Sigebert, who had been converted and baptized in Gaul by St. Columbanus, could think of none better qualified than the monastic compatriots of that great apostle to win over the hearts of a rude and fractious people. Simple wants, a winning kindliness of manner, an unostentatious but profound piety, an unfailing cheerfulness under all physical drawbacks or moral difficulties were the invariable characteristics of those wonderful men who, coming forth from the Isle of Destiny, had spread themselves over the West of Europe, to sow the seed and gather the harvest where the swords of Attila's Huns had ploughed and drenched the soil. Augustin Thierry testifies to the hold they speedily obtained over the people of the Continent by their simplicity of life, their wonderful eloquence and the extreme ease with which they conformed to the customs and the way of life of the localities where they settled down to their beneficent labors. They asked nothing more than ground on which to build their encampment of wattled huts, and this once given, as it was in most cases, most gladly, it was not long ere the scrubby and weed-overgrown waste bloomed forth as a garden. Their whole outfit, according to the eminent antiquary, Dr. Wattenbach, consisted of a pilgrim's staff, a wallet, a little case containing holy relics and a leathern water-bottle. Money or valuables they neither possessed nor accepted. Their practice was to pitch their encampment in the vicinity of some large town or city; and thus, says Dr. Wattenbach, "they first supplied the defect in the organization of Christian society which arose with the development of cities, for until their time monasteries had been founded only in the solitude of the country, excepting such as were attached to episcopal seats." Sigebert had had personal experience of these blessings and potencies; hence when he heard that a company of these saintly Irish missionaries had landed on the opposite shores of Britain, under the leadership of Fursey, he lost no time in inducing them to visit his kingdom and in placing a piece of ground at

their disposal. Here, according to the Venerable Bede, while converting many unbelievers to Christ by the example of his virtues and the efficacy of his preaching, Fursey was again visited by his angelic friends and admonished to proceed diligently with his work as well as to continue his watching and prayers. In consequence of this vision, adds the historian, he applied himself with all speed to build a monastery on the ground given him by King Sigebert, and to establish regular discipline therein. The site was formerly the Roman station called Ganionum, but when the Romans had evacuated Britain, their Saxon successors had given the place the less euphonious name of Cnobbersburgh. On this site St. Fursey built his monastery, and Venerable Bede says it was a noble one, and worthy of its great object. After Sigebert's death his successor and the nobility of the kingdom endowed it richly, so that it soon sprang into a cluster of stately buildings, attracting many of the youth of the country to the religious life.

During this period of his life there were many repetitions, Venerable Bede tells us, of those wonderful hints from the world beyond which made Saint Fursey take the initial step in his missionary career. "As for the matter of his visions," he says, "he would only relate them to those who from holy zeal and desire of reformation, wished to learn the same." Whatever the hearer or reader of those extraordinary revelations might think or feel about their relation, they would seem to have had phenomenal effects upon their subject. Bede himself did not witness what he writes of, but he declares he has had the story from good sources. One of the witnesses whom he quotes testifies that though it was mid-winter weather, with a sharp frost, when St. Fursey was telling of his trans-mundane experiences, and though the narrator had on only a thin garment, perspiration poured from him as though it were a hot day in summer.

In this epoch of high criticism it will take much argument to convince any student of the exacting kind that there is any value whatever to be placed upon such primitive legends. They will not be accepted as proof that such visions were beheld by those who declared themselves their subjects, or that, if they were so beheld, they establish anything more than a preternaturally active brain on the part of the beholders. It is impossible, however, to deny the existence of a mass of definite lore upon the subject, and a concurrence of testimony on the part of witnesses separated by long intervals of time and latitude. The Visions of Tundale, the Voyage of St. Brendan and the story of St. Patrick's Purgatory were fused into a Latin romance, purporting to relate the supernatural experiences of the Knight Owen Miles, by Henry, a monk of Saltry, in

Huntingdonshire; and this work soon acquired a European reputation. An English translation of it was quickly followed by three different metrical renderings in French, as well as one in Anglo-Norman by the famous poetess Marie de France. As this stream of undoubtedly Celtic origin rolled down the years it received many an accession from other springs and rivulets. It was swollen by the visions of St. Mechtildis, St. Hildegarde, St. Elizabeth of Schönau, St. Bridget of Sweden and the Italian monk Alberic, of Monte Cassino. Giraldus Cambrensis, who traveled through Ireland for the purpose of calumniating its people, refers to the mysterious lakes and islands of Ulster with their terrible but glorious associations. In the next century Matthew Paris related the progress of a pilgrim through the purgatorial regions, and Froissart, later on, also embodied the narrative in his Chronicles. In an Italian romance (attributed to Andrea Patria) of the same period, the "Guerrino detto il Meschino," a similar pilgrimage of one of Charlemagne's knights was very popular. So famous had Lough Derg become by reason of these legends and romances that pilgrimages to it became the order of the day. The late Sir John Gilbert quoted extracts from the archives of Dublin Castle giving certificates from King Edward III. declaring that certain Italian noblemen had faithfully performed the Lough Derg pilgrimage. In these documents the place is referred to as "the Purgatory of St. Patrick." These noblemen were Malatesta Ungaro, of Rimini, and Nicolo Beccaria, of Ferrara. This quaint royal document is so much evidence of the genuine piety of those early days and indirectly of the authenticity of the stories about the "Purgatory," that it is not amiss to quote it, as translated by Sir John Gilbert from the old Norman-French:

"Among the archives of England are enrolled certificates, issued by Edward III. during the viceroyalty of St. Amand, declaring that Malatesta Ungaro of Rimini, and Nicolo de Beccaria of Ferrara, had performed pilgrimages to the famous Purgatory of St. Patrick, Lough Derg. Ungaro, Lord of Rimini, Fano, Pesano and Fossombrone, was renowned in Italy for his warlike enterprises, his knowledge and piety. 'Whereas,' wrote the King of England, 'Malatesta Ungaro, of Rimini, a nobleman and knight, hath presented himself before us, and declared that, traveling from his own country, he had, with many bodily toils, visited the Purgatory of St. Patrick, in our land of Ireland, and for the space of a day and a night, as is the custom, remained therein enclosed, and now earnestly beseeches us that, for the confirmation of the truth thereof, we should grant him our royal letters: we, therefore, considering the dangers and perils of his pilgrimage, and although the assertion

of such a noble might on this suffice, yet we are further certified thereof by letters from our trusty and beloved Almaric de St. Amand, knight, justiciary of Ireland, and from the prior and convent of the said Purgatory, and others of great credit, as also by clear evidence, that the said nobleman had duly and courageously performed his pilgrimage; we have consequently thought worthy to give favorably unto him our royal authority concerning the same, to the end there may be no doubt made of the premised; and that the truth may more clearly appear, we have deemed proper to grant unto him these our letters, under our royal seal.'"¹

Whether Dante was ever really in Oxford, as some writers believe, or not, there is not the smallest doubt that he was well versed in all the marvelous legendary lore of Ireland. He was, as the Vicomte de Villamonque declared, "nurtured on the marrow of Celtic legends." Fazio degli Uberti, in his famous poem called "The Dittamondo," leaves us in no doubt of the familiarity of the early Italian writers with the subject of the famous "Purgatory." A crude English translation of this work, unearthed by the graceful Irish essayist, the late Mrs. Sarah Atkinson, embraces in a cursory general description of Ireland this special reference to Lough Derg:

"Thus, exploring the distant parts of the country and making inquiries on the way, we got information concerning a certain very holy and devout monastery. Thither we betook ourselves, and there were hospitably received. The good monks conducted us to the cave which makes the blessed Patrick so famous.

"'What shall we do?' said my beloved counsellor to me. 'Do you wish to pass within? You are so anxious to fathom the meaning of everything new and strange!'

"'No,' I replied, 'I will not enter without the advice of the monks; for it is terrible to me to think of penetrating to the very depths of hell.'

"Thereupon one of the monks answered: 'If you do not feel yourself pure and clean, resolute and full of faith, you cannot be sure of returning should you enter.'

"And I said: 'If you can satisfy me on this point: rumors are afloat through the world concerning many who have come back from those torments.'

"To which he replied: 'With regard to Patrick and Nicholas, there can be no doubt whatever that they went in and returned by this entrance. As for the others, I cannot venture to say that one

¹ Dr. Gilbert gives in a note (p. 543) a passage from Muratori's *Annals of Italy*, in which the last illness of the aged Malatesta, Lord of Rimini [A. D. 1364] is referred to and a high testimony borne to the piety and good works by which such edification was given in his latter days. The certificate given above is inscribed on the patent rolls in the Tower of London, under the year 1358.

in a hundred may not have the reputation of having made the descent. But I do not know one for certain.'

"Solinus broke in: 'Put away this idea and do not tempt your God. It would be a grievous thing if any one were to perish here. It is enough for us to carry on our researches above ground.'

"'You are quite right,' said the monk. And then, departing, we bade farewell to the community whom we left behind."

Italian MSS. versions of the Voyage of St. Brendan, St. Patrick's Purgatory, the Visions of Tundale and some minor Irish legends of a similar character were extant in Dante's time, as Professor Villari, at the Dante centenary of 1865, demonstrated. These fascinating snatches of the supernatural, this learned authority believes, had a powerful effect upon the poet's imagination. We find many scenes, many personages and many punishments related in those legends utilized in Dante's descriptions. The portrayal of the figure of Lucifer especially he finds suggested by the weird and terrific limning of the early Irish depicitors.

In his "Heroes and Hero-Worship" Carlyle touches upon this question of the genesis of the "Divina Commedia," but in a characteristic way. In his grandiose, jerky and didactic method he recalls the fact that Dante is but the craftsman, the smith fashioning the metal he finds to his hand. "He is the spokesman of the Middle Ages; the thought they lived by stands here, in everlasting music." This is very fine, and no less true. But it is not very honest. Carlyle suppressed the fact that the thought was furnished by the Irish Celt, for the simple reason that he detested the very name. Ireland, to him, was the home of "human swine." What heroes could come out of such a land as this?

That eminent priest and antiquary, Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, in his "Lives of Irish Saints," establishes still more closely the connection between the Irish legends and the great Italian poem. He sees in the "Visions of St. Fursey" the prime idea as well as the plan of Dante's work. Various passages, which he juxtaposes with each other, in both works show so much similarity in thought and phrase as to leave no doubt of the immediate connection. The venerable Canon has made a special study of Lough Derg, its present conditions, its past, its voluminous literature and its earliest traditions. Lough Derg, where the "Purgatory" is situate, lies in the County Donegal, not far from the town of Ballyshannon. On its bosom there are several small islands. To two of these in especial—Station Island and Saint's Island—the footsteps of the pilgrims have been turned all the centuries during which the fame of the place has proved magnetic; and thither still, it may be remarked, crowds of the devout in Ireland and from distant Catholic places wend their

way to go through salutary penitential exercises, in the season between June and Lady Day in August. As early as the sixth century a monastery was founded on Saint's Island by St. Dabheoc, and later on, all during the Middle Ages, the Canons Regular of St. Augustine had a religious house on the same island, till they were expelled by the emissaries of the recreant Stuart monarch, James the First. At present it is Station Island which is most affected by the great body of the pious visitors. The locality, situated in the midst of a desolate brown moorland, ringed around with low, shapeless heather-clad masses of hillocks, is dreary and depressing; hence it is not wonderful that the impressionable Irish mind early linked the place with the world of the weird and the terrible. Canon O'Hanlon has traced this impression even so far back as pre-Christian days in Ireland. In a more recent work of his called "Irish Local Legends, he links the past with the present in this web of folk-lore regarding Saint's Island:

"In the old Pagan times a peistha or water serpent of immense girth and of still greater trail was believed to haunt the celebrated Lough Derg in the northern parts of Ireland. Sometimes his horrid head and open jaws were seen above the surface, as if drawing in the upper air. More frequently the fishermen saw him gliding slowly through the depths. When St. Patrick landed at Saint's Island that large water serpent was known to have tenanted the waters of Lough Derg. He had caused the destruction of many a dwelling on the banks. But the Saint could not tolerate the presence of such a monster, and accordingly with a stroke of his staff the peistha was destroyed. Afterwards the waters of the lough began to assume a reddish tinge, so freely did the monster bleed, and to the present day has that color continued; hence the name given to it—Red Lake. The skeleton remained on Station Island to the beginning of the present century, as the old people living around the shore are ready to asseverate; and many of them have conversed with persons who alleged they saw the last remaining portions of that serpent's body mouldering into dust."

Dante may have heard of this monster, regarded, no doubt, as a sort of guardian of the mysterious region beyond the material world at Lough Derg. As he approaches the city of Dis, the metropolis of Lucifer, he descries the Furies above the chief portals, surrounded by thousands of demons. The horrent damsels, as depicted in Greek mythology, were represented with coils of serpents for hair. Dante gives them an addition:

"Around them greenest hydras twisting roll'd
Their volumes, adders and cerastes crept
Instead of hair, and their fierce temples bound."

But as in Dante symbolism is usually intended by the introduction of animal life into various pictures, so in the literature of St. Patrick's Purgatory the same media may be employed for a similar purpose. The driving out of serpents and venomous creatures generally, ascribed to the Apostle of Ireland, would seem to be merely allegorical; for there are no fossils or skeletons of saurian species found in the island, and Cambrensis and other early writers, noting the absence of such noxious forms of animal life, explain it by the quality of the air and the soil, whose peculiar property it is that nothing venomous can find vitality there. But, while it seems useless to speculate on the origin of this curious legend of a water-serpent at Lough Derg, it is highly probable that it came, together with the rest of the folk-lore concerning the mysterious region, to the ears of Dante, and helped in the formation of his own symbolism in the "Commedia."

There can be no doubt whatever, then, that the structure of Dante's work was almost entirely compact of Celtic material. This does not detract, by any means, from the majesty of the work. The great fabric of theology, philosophy, metaphysics, astronomy and history which he has reared out of the crude mediæval story is not affected in its claim to originality by the points of resemblance it presents either to St. Fursey's Vision or the references in the "Dittamondo."

He would, indeed, be an exacting critic who demanded entirely new materials as well as entire novelty in treatment in such great creations of master-minds. Of such a one Dante might complain, as Beatrice does to the angels when apologizing for her admirer:

"When from flesh
To spirit I had risen, and increase
Of beauty and of virtue circled me,
I was less dear to him, and valued less."

The difference between the ancient legends and the sublime edifice of Dante's poem may not inappropriately be likened to the change from flesh to spirit—from the bald and meagre statement to the myriad-hued, subtly-woven, empyrean-piercing epic of the soul which has justly earned the title of Divine.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

REVIEW OF THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.—II.

IN our first paper we have reviewed the Pauline chronology as far as it coincides with the historical part of the Book of Acts or down to the end of the Apostle's two years' imprisonment in Rome, and we have seen that the so-called New Chronology places this event about 59 A. D., while the Old Chronology dates it about 63 A. D. All agree that Paul died in the persecution of Nero, which began A. D. 64 and cannot have lasted beyond the Emperor's death, June 9, A. D. 68. But this leaves four or five years open for the martyrdom of Paul, and our nineteenth century critics have improved of their opportunity for hypothesis and conjecture. There are those who contend that the Apostle suffered martyrdom after his two years' Roman captivity mentioned at the close of Acts, A. D. 64;¹ others are of opinion that Paul was set free after his two years' imprisonment, about 59 A. D., and that after the lapse of five years he was taken again and put to death in July, A. D. 64;² others again maintain that the Apostle's liberation took place about A. D. 63, and his death A. D. 67.³ Onmitting in the present paper the minor difficulties of the subject, we shall dwell only on the principal questions: 1. Was Paul set free after a detention of two years in Rome? 2. Does the Apostle's double Roman imprisonment agree better with the New Chronology than with the Old? 3. What are the main events of Paul's life that intervene between his first Roman imprisonment and the second? Were we to answer these questions in order, we should have to quote the same authorities three times; in order to avoid useless repetition, we shall first investigate all the evidence referring to the points in question, and then briefly sum up the conclusions.

1. *The Pauline Epistles.* It is plain from Phil. i., 7, 13; iv., 22, that the Apostle wrote this epistle when he was in "bonds," near the "court," with the saints "of Cæsar's household;" in other words, when he was a prisoner in Rome. What the Apostle says, i., 12-20, about the success of his labors in his bonds leads us to believe that he must have been some time in Rome before writing to the Philippians. From this we infer that the prisoner was tolerably well acquainted with the hopes and dangers of his case. Now, though the words of i., 20, "so now also shall Christ be magnified in my

¹ Cf. Jülicher, *Einkl.*, p. 125. ² Cf. Harnack, *Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur*, pp. 240 ff. ³ Cf. Zahn, *Einkl. in d. N. T.*, i., pp. 435 ff.

body, whether (it be) by life or by death," show that Paul has not as yet absolute certainty concerning his future fate; still, a few lines further on¹ he expresses his sincere conviction that his present captivity will not end in death: "But to abide still in the flesh is needful for you. And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide, and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." This hope is repeated in even clearer terms in the second chapter:² "And I trust in the Lord that I myself shall also come to you shortly." Finally, the epistle to Philemon,³ probably written a little later than the epistle to the Philippians, contains the express warning: "But withal prepare me also a lodging. For I hope that through your prayers I shall be given unto you." If we add to these passages Rom. xv., 24, "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, I hope that as I pass, I shall see you," we obtain the following results: 1, The Apostle clearly expected a sentence of acquittal in Rome; 2, he intended to visit the church at Philippi, in Macedonia, and Philemon, in Asia Minor, after his acquittal; 3, we may suppose that during his Roman captivity he had not given up his intention of visiting Spain.

These inferences are confirmed by the following considerations: First, as far as the Roman authorities were concerned, they had no special charge against the Apostle; the Governor, Festus, did not know what to write against him,⁴ and the persecution of Christians had not yet begun. For, according to Act. xxviii., 30, Paul "remained two whole years in his own hired lodging," so that even if we assume that he arrived in Rome only in the spring of A. D. 62, his fate must have been decided before the beginning of the persecution, October A. D. 64. That this last event cannot have occurred before October may be inferred from Tacitus,⁵ who testifies that the persecution broke out on account of the fire, and at the same time⁶ places between the fire, July 18-24, and the persecution a great number of other events. Secondly, the Jewish authorities appear to have been quite remiss in prosecuting their charge against the Apostle. When the latter arrived in Rome, the Jewish community there testified: "We neither received letters concerning thee from Judea, neither did any of the brethren that came hither relate or speak any evil of thee."⁷ There is no sign of any renewed hostility during the two following years; the Jews were so sorely pressed by the vicious government of their procurator, Albinus, 62-64 A. D.,⁸ that they found no time to urge the condemnation of the prisoner who had vanished from their sight and whose reputed crime was a matter of the past. Thirdly, the contents of Tit. and I., II. Tim., as compared with

¹ I. 24, 25. ² II. 124. ³ 22. ⁴ Act xxv., 18 ff.; xxvi., 32. ⁵ Ann. xv., 38-41; cf. Sueton. Nero, 38; Eus. Chron. a. Abrah. 2079. ⁶ Ibid. cc. 42-47. ⁷ Act xxviii., 21. ⁸ Cf. Schürer, "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ." I., ii., p. 188.

the narrative of the Book of Acts, show that these epistles were not written before or during the Apostle's two years' Roman captivity.¹ Besides, the epistle to Titus must have been written in the vicinity of Nicopolis in Epirus,² I. Tim. in Macedonia,³ and II. Tim. again in a Roman prison, but under circumstances wholly different from those accompanying the Apostle's first detention.⁴ If, then, these three pastoral epistles are authentic, and their authenticity cannot be doubted, the Apostle must have recovered his freedom after his first Roman captivity, journeyed through parts of Greece and Asia Minor, and then fallen again into the hands of the Roman authorities. Zahn⁵ points out that these conclusions are valid even if we make the false supposition that Tit., I., II. Tim. are spurious, being written by a pseudo-Paul between 70 and 140 A. D. For had not Christian tradition even at that early date clearly contained the record of Paul's two Roman imprisonments and of the intervening journeys, no pseudonymous writer could have dared to connect these events so closely with his would-be Pauline epistles. Finally, the author of Acts would certainly have acted very strangely in omitting the death of the Apostle, if it had occurred immediately after his two years' imprisonment. After devoting chapters xv.-xxviii. to the history of Paul, relating often incidents of minor importance, he naturally must be expected to give an account of the Apostle's martyrdom, too, if it falls within the range of his narrative. From the silence of Acts on this event we rightly infer that it occurred after the times chronicled in Acts.

Against the inference that Paul, after his sentence of acquittal in Rome, revisited the churches of Asia Minor, our opponents allege the words of the Apostle as recorded in Act xx., 25: "And now behold I know that all you, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." At first sight the exception appears to be valid, since the context of the words shows that they were spoken at Miletus to the ancients of Ephesus about two years and a half before the Apostle's first Roman captivity. To say that our inferences have been derived from Paul's words as written down by himself, while the exception is based on Paul's words as recorded by another person, either does not remove the difficulty or creates a new one against the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture. Nor is it consistent with the nature of inspiration to assume that Paul inspired (Act. xx., 25) must be corrected by Paul inspired (Phil. ii., 24). Again, it can hardly be maintained that the Apostle, in Act xx., 25, does not refer to a mere visit, but speaks of a permanent relation of shepherd and flock. It would be equally nugatory to contend that the Apostle may have revisited the

¹ Cf. Cornely, *Introd. in U. T.*, iii., pp. 563, 569, 576. ² Tit. iii., 12. ³ I. Tim. i., 3; iii., 14, 15. ⁴ II. Tim. iv., 6 ff.; i., 8, 16, 17, etc. ⁵ *Einleit.*, i., p. 439.

churches of Asia Minor without seeing the elders of Ephesus; for in I. Tim. i., 3, he is represented as going from Ephesus to Macedonia, and according to I. Tim. iii., 14, he expects to return to Ephesus shortly. The only satisfactory solution therefore is found in the assumption that the uninspired words of the Apostle as recorded by the inspired author of Acts must be corrected by the inspired words of the same Apostle as recorded in Phil., Philem., Tit., I. and II. Tim.; in other words, Acts xx., 25, records a merely natural persuasion of the Apostle which proved to be false in the event, though it seemed to be well founded when Paul gave utterance to it.

To sum up the results of our investigation of the Pauline epistles, the Apostle regained his liberty A. D. 63, or early in 64; he visited Crete,¹ the churches of Asia, and especially Ephesus,² the churches of Macedonia,³ then Asia again,⁴ by way of Troas,⁵ and finally went by way of Miletus⁶ to Nicopolis,⁷ and through Macedonia and Achaia to Corinth⁸ and Rome. Nor can it be said that these various journeys of the Apostle must be identified with those recorded in Acts. That his visit to Crete mentioned in Tit. i., 5, cannot be the same as that mentioned in Acts xxvii., 7, ff., follows from the fact that during the latter he was a prisoner, while he was free during the former.⁹ Again, the Cretan visit cannot fall in the time before Paul's residence in Ephesus during his third missionary journey; for at that time Apollo was not yet among the Apostle's companions,¹⁰ while this was the case at the time of the Cretan visit.¹¹ Since, finally, the visit in question cannot fall in the period of the Apostle's residence at Ephesus,¹² it must evidently have occurred after his first Roman captivity. The same line of reasoning may be followed as to the time of the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in I. Tim. i., 3. It cannot be identical with the journey recorded in Acts xx., 1, since, before and during the latter, Timothy was absent from Ephesus, having been sent into Macedonia,¹³ where he stayed with Paul when writing the second epistle to the Corinthians,¹⁴ while during the journey mentioned in I. Tim. i., 3, Timothy remained at Ephesus. Finally, the Apostle's journey to Rome, related in the last chapters of Acts, cannot be identified with that presupposed in II. Tim.; for on the latter the Apostle passed through Troas,¹⁵ Miletus and Corinth,¹⁶ places which he did not touch on his former Roman journey.¹⁷

2. *The epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* was certainly written about 96 A. D. In it the Roman Church deplores the feuds that have gained ground in the Church at Corinth, whose present state

¹ Tit. i., 5. ² Tim. i., 3. ³ I. Tim. i., 3. ⁴ I. Tim. iii., 14. ⁵ II. Tim. iv., 13. ⁶ II. Tim. iv., 20. ⁷ Tit. iii., 12. ⁸ II. Tim. iv., 20. ⁹ Tit. iii., 12. ¹⁰ Cf. Act xviii., 24; I. Cor. xvi., 12. ¹¹ Tit. iii., 13. ¹² Act xix., 9 f.; xx., 31. ¹³ Act xix., 22. ¹⁴ II. Cor. i., 1. ¹⁵ II. Tim. iv., 13. ¹⁶ II. Tim. iv., 20. ¹⁷ Act xxvii., xxviii

is wholly different from their exemplary concord and charity in the past. Now, their ruling passion is envy, which led Cain to slay his brother, sent Jacob into exile, persecuted Joseph, compelled Moses to flee, drove Aaron and Miriam out of the camp, threw Dathan and Abiram alive into the pit, and incited Saul against David. After developing these thoughts the writer comes to the passage that bears on our present question. "But to pass from the examples of ancient days, let us come to those champions who lived nearest to our time. Let us set before us the noble examples which belong to our generation. By reason of jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted, and contended even unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles. There was Peter, who, by reason of unrighteous jealousy, endured not one or two, but many labors, and thus having borne his testimony, went to his appointed place of glory. By reason of jealousy and strife Paul, by his example, pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurance."¹

In order to appreciate this passage at its full value, we must add the following considerations. First, the writer speaks of persons he has known and of facts he has witnessed. This is rendered most probable by several expressions that occur in the passage. The phrase rendered, "who lived nearest to our time," reads in Greek, ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑγγιστά γενομένους "to those that are nearest" to us either in time or in place. That the writer implies nearness of time follows from the expression in the next sentence, "which belong to our generation." That nearness of place is implied may be inferred from the phrase, "among ourselves," occurring in the first sentence after the passage we have quoted. Besides, the author betrays a certain degree of familiarity with his two heroes: Not to mention his accurate information "that he (Paul) had been seven times in bonds," a statement that occurs in no written document before 96 A. D., we must draw attention to the phrase rendered, "let us set before our eyes the good Apostles." For Zahn² has pointed out that, according to the usual Greek construction, we must translate "let us take in view our good apostles," i. e., the apostles of the Romans and the Corinthians; the writer appears to imply a per-

¹ Clem. I. Cor. 5; Engl. transl. by Lightfoot. ² Einl. i., pp. 445 f.

sonal acquaintance with them, both on his part and on that of his readers. If the words of Clement contained no such implication, there would be no reason for restricting the meaning of "our good Apostles" to Peter and Paul alone, since the suffering of James and of the other Apostles would have illustrated the point in question equally well.

Secondly, according to the passage of Clement, Paul suffered martyrdom during the persecution of Nero, though the year of his suffering is not accurately determined. It is true that in the language of Clement, *μαρτυρεῖν*, "to bear testimony," does not yet have the meaning, "to suffer martyrdom," which it acquired during the course of the second century; but the whole context of the passage shows that the testimony borne by Paul immediately preceded his suffering. On the one hand, the phrase "contended unto death" prepares us for this meaning, and on the other, the climax requires it. The sufferers are described as the "champions who lived nearest to our time," and again, as the "noble examples which belong to our generation." This is the sort of language which implies a certain lapse of time, and yet the persons so designated can well be the contemporaries of the writer. Now all the early Church writers, Melito, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, speak of the first persecution under Nero, and the second, under Domitian; from their universal silence we safely infer that the intermediate reigns between Nero and Domitian formed a period of a general peace for the Church.¹ Now, Clement wrote towards the end of the reign of Domitian, so that he places the martyrdom of the Apostles in the persecution of Nero (A. D. 64-67) by reason of the interval he demands between the time of writing and the time of the Apostles' suffering. Again, there are writers who infer from the phrase "when he had borne testimony before the rulers" that Paul was tried and condemned not before the Emperor Nero, but before his prefects, Tigillinus and Nymphidius; in other words, that Paul was tried during Nero's absence from Rome. And since the Emperor visited Greece A. D. 67, these same writers infer from Clement's testimony that Paul suffered A. D. 67. The inference as it stands is defective, seeing that *οἱ ἡγεῖμενοι*, "the rulers," signifies the highest authorities, including even the Emperor. But since Clement would most probably have mentioned the fact of the Emperor's presence, if Paul had really been tried before him, we may agree with the conclusion of the foregoing writers, though we do not grant their premises.

¹ The only exception to this universal belief is Hilary, who mentions Vespasian as a persecutor of the Church. If his language be not founded on a misapprehension, it must refer to some merely local troubles in Gaul.

Thirdly, according to Clement, Paul visited Spain before he suffered martyrdom. It is true that this cannot be inferred from the expression "preached in the East and the West," since this would be true even if the Apostle had come only as far as Rome. Nor can it be inferred from the words "having taught righteousness unto the whole world," since they might be regarded as an oratorical embellishment of Paul's apostolic labors. But such explanations cannot be applied to the phrase "having reached the farthest bounds of the West." For the Greek word τὸ τέρμα does not signify the limit at which something begins,¹ but has been properly rendered "the farthest bounds;" nor can we interpret "having reached the end (of his apostolic career) of (in) the West,"² since such a rendering not only does violence to the language, but implies an opposition between the Apostle's western and eastern termination of his missionary labors. Finally, it is not implied in the words of Clement that the Apostle "departed from the world," "when he had borne testimony before the rulers" in "the farthest bounds of the West,"³ for the material succession of phrases does not force us to assume an identity of place for the various actions mentioned. If it be true, therefore, that the English translator has rightly interpreted the Greek phrase by "the farthest bounds of the West," it is not less true that in the language of a Roman writer this phrase designates Spain. For living in the metropolis and centre of power, he could not speak of it as "the extreme West," especially at a time when many eminent Latin authors and statesmen were or had been natives of Spain, and when Strabo,⁴ Velleius Paterculus⁵ and Appian⁶ applied the foregoing description to the Spanish coast.⁷ This is the natural way of speaking, while the interpretations "his extreme limit towards the West,"⁸ "the sunset of his labors,"⁹ "the boundary between the East and the West,"¹⁰ "the goal or centre of the West,"¹¹ "before the supreme power of the West"¹² are as violent as they are false.

To sum up the results of our study of Clement's testimony, we infer from his words: 1. Paul extended his missionary labors even into Spain; this supposes that the Apostle regained his liberty after his first Roman captivity. 2. (Peter and) Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome during the persecution of Nero, probably A. D. 67. Since Clement wrote at a time when the history of the Apostle was still fresh in the memory of his readers, his epistle naturally supposes the knowledge of many facts unknown to us, and appears, therefore, obscure or incomplete to the reader of our age. If we keep these

¹ Hilgenfeld. ² Baur, Paulus, Hilgenfeld, Otto. ³ Lipsius. ⁴ ii. 1, 4; iii., 1, 5. ⁵ i., 2. ⁶ Bell. civ. v., 64. ⁷ Cf. Lightfoot, Clement ii., 30. ⁸ Baur, Schenkel. ⁹ Reuss. ¹⁰ Schrader, Hilgenfeld. ¹¹ Matthies. ¹² Wieseler, Schaff.

facts in mind, we shall not be tempted to consider the foregoing commentary of Clement's passage far-fetched or violent. The writers of a later age address readers less well acquainted with the facts of the apostolic times; hence their statements must be more explicit, and they are therefore clearer to us. It is for this reason that the following testimonies need less explanation.

3. *Testimony of the second century.* a. The Muratorian Canon is ascribed by various critics to different epochs between about A. D. 160 and A. D. 220; it is generally placed about A. D. 170, though Harnack¹ dates it about A. D. 200. All the necessary information respecting the text will be found in Tregelles' Canon Muratorianus² and in Westcott's History of the Canon.³ Though the actual text is not certain in all points, there can be no reasonable doubt that, according to the writer, Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, only records incidents which took place in his presence, and that, therefore, his silence about the martyrdom of Peter, or the journey of Paul into Spain, evidently shows that he was not present at either of these events. The words of interest to us read: *sicuti et semote (-ta) passionem (-ne) Petri evidenter declarat, sed et profectionem (-ne) Pauli ab urbe in Spaniam proficiscentis*—"as he evidently shows by setting aside without notice the martyrdom of Peter, and even the journey of Paul from the city to Spain." It is clear that the writer lived in the "city" (Rome) and had not the slightest doubt as to Paul's journey into Spain; we need not repeat that the Apostle's acquittal in his first Roman trial is implied in the writer's statement.

b. The apocryphal *Acta Pauli* are placed by Harnack between A. D. 120 and A. D. 170; by Zahn about A. D. 160. Though the work has been imperfectly preserved, it certainly supposes that Paul was set free after his first Roman captivity. At the time when Titus had returned to Rome from Dalmatia, and Crescens (Luke) from Gaul (Galatia), Paul is still outside the city.⁴ He is taken prisoner only after he has worked some time in Rome. It cannot be said that the *Acta Pauli* do not know of any prior Roman residence of the Apostle. For according to reliable records, the *Acta* related a meeting of Peter and Paul in Rome. Now nothing is said of such a meeting in the history of Paul's last stay in Rome, which has been preserved entire. The *Acta* must have contained, therefore, the report of a prior stay of the Apostle in the capital.

c. The *Acta Petri* are ascribed by Harnack to the first half of the third century, while Zahn dates them about A. D. 160. Without en-

¹ *Geschichte d. altchristl. Literat.* ii., p. 646. ² Oxford, 1867. ³ *Append. C.* ⁴ *Lipsius*, p. 104; cf. p. 23. We need not state that this order of facts does not well harmonize with II. Tim. iv., 10.

tering into the question whether the writing is tainted with Gnosticism or exhibits strictly orthodox doctrine, we confine ourselves to what concerns the life of Paul. The Apostle was freed from his first captivity in Rome not by a sentence of acquittal, but through the kindness of his convert jailer; "Quartus permansit (permisit) Paulo ut ubi vellet iret ab urbe."¹ Paul goes to Spain at the bidding of a vision which he received after a three days' fast;² at the request of the Roman Christians not to forget them, and not to stay away long (ut annum plus non abesset), a voice is heard from heaven: Inter manus Neronis . . . sub oculis vestris consummabitur.³ Many accompany the Apostle to Portus, and two youths go with him to Spain.⁴ Not to mention the other passages in which reference is made to this part of the Apostle's life,⁵ we must state that at the bidding of Paul, Timothy and Barnabas set out from Rome for Philippi about the beginning of the Apostle's journey to Spain.⁶ Here the *Acta* seem to refer to Phil. ii., 19. At any rate, there is no doubt as to Paul's leaving Rome after his first imprisonment and as to his journey to Spain.

d. Tertullian most explicitly assigns the martyrdom of Paul to the time of Nero.⁷ The words of Dionysius of Corinth⁸ and of Irenæus⁹ refer rather to the simultaneous suffering of Peter and Paul than to its definite time. Hippolytus¹⁰ refers to the end of Paul's life only indefinitely, saying that Simon Magus resisted the apostles (Peter and Paul) in Rome. We cannot here determine whether the Muratorian Canon was written by Hippolytus. It would be folly to say that the tradition concerning Paul's journey to Spain arose out of Rom. xv., 24-28; the Apostle's intention expressed in the latter passages had been frustrated so evidently that no fiction of a later missionary excursion to the extreme west would be received as its fulfilment.

4. *Testimony of the subsequent centuries.* Though the foregoing evidence is amply sufficient to prove the existence of an early tradition on the subject-matter we are now discussing, the following witnesses will at least show that this tradition did not disappear with the writers of the first and second centuries. The fact that Origen¹¹ describes Paul's missionary labors in the Apostle's own words (Rom. xv., 19) does not show that this learned writer knew nothing of the Apostle's Spanish mission; we might infer in the same way that Origen knew nothing of Paul's Roman ministry. Besides, Zahn¹² has shown that Origen was acquainted with the

¹ Lipsius 45, 6. ² Lips. 45, 8. ³ Lips., p. 46, 3, 8. ⁴ Lips., p. 48, 8, 17. ⁵ Cf. Lips., 51, 26; 45, 10, 12; 100, 13. ⁶ Lips. 49, 9. ⁷ Cf. Apol. 5, 21; Scorp. 15; Præscr. 36. ⁸ Eus. H. E. ii., 25, 8; cf. iv., 23, 9-12. ⁹ III., i., 1; iii., 2, 3. ¹⁰ Refut. vi., 20. ¹¹ Cf. Eus. H. E. iii., 1. ¹² Geschichte d. nt. Kanons ii., 866, 878.

Acta Pauli, and could not, therefore, be ignorant of the Apostle's journey to Spain. On the other hand, it is not clear that the great Alexandrian alludes to this fact in hom. 13 in Gen.

Eusebius usually summarizes the prior patristic tradition with sufficient accuracy. Now, in his *Ecclesiastical History*¹ this writer expressly states that Paul was taken prisoner a second time in Rome after he had escaped from the mouth of the lion (Nero) the first time. Certain writers² infer from the arrangement of the material in H. E. II. xxv., xxvi., that the Apostle must have suffered martyrdom about the beginning of the Jewish war. Eusebius himself, in his *Chronicon*, places the death of Paul in a certain year: according to the Armenian version³ in the year of Abraham 2083, or A. D. 67, according to Jerome's version in the year of Abraham 2084, or A. D. 68. The two versions differ also in their text. The Armenian text reads: "Nero super omnia delicta primus persecutiones in Christianos excitavit, sub quo Petrus et Paulus apostoli Romæ martyrium passi sunt," while Jerome's text has "persecutionem" instead of "persecutiones," and "in qua" instead of "sub quo." In other words, according to the Armenian version, "Nero, under whom Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome, raised persecutions against the Christians," while according to the text of Jerome "Nero raised a persecution against the Christians in which Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome." It is true that we have here a difference of form between the Armenian text of Eusebius and the Hieronymian; but considering the fact that Eusebius placed the death of Paul, as well as the Neronian persecution of Christians, in A. D. 67 (68), Jerome cannot have been very wrong in his inference that the former event happened during the course of the latter. Since Eusebius mentions the fire in Rome in connection with the year of Abraham 2079, or A. D. 63 (Jerome's text: The year of Abraham 2080, or A. D. 64), and thus explicitly admits an interval of several years between the fire and the death of the Apostle, we cannot assume that the date of the latter event was unknown to the historian.

Harnack⁴ argues thus against the foregoing explanation: Eusebius places the beginning of the Neronian persecution and the death of Peter and Paul in the same year; but we know from Tacitus that the Neronian persecution began A. D. 64; hence Eusebius testifies that Peter and Paul died A. D. 64. Granting the minor premise for the present, we deny the major as it is expressed by Harnack. For Eusebius does not speak of the "beginning" of any persecution; in fact, according to the Armenian text, he speaks of "persecutions," and moreover he distinctly separates these "perse-

¹ II., xxii., 5. ² Theodor., cf. Swete i., 115. ³ Cf. Schœne ii., 156. ⁴ *Chronologie*, p. 241.

cutions" from the year of the fire, A. D. 64. In doing so he must have followed a tradition that was as clear respecting the year of the Apostle's death as is the text of Tacitus respecting the year of the Roman fire. In other words, the exception of Harnack supposes that Eusebius must have made a mistake as to the year of Nero's persecution. Is it not quite as probable that Professor Harnack makes a mistake as to the duration of this persecution which he supposes to have lasted only a short time, without giving us any reason for his supposition? The foregoing plural "persecutions" points in the opposite direction. Euthalius, about A. D. 350, appeals to the Chronicon of Eusebius for the truth of his statement that Paul died in the thirteenth year of Nero, A. D. 67. Epiphanius¹ appears to have been led by the same authority to place the death of the two Apostles in the twelfth year of Nero, while Jerome's version places it in the fourteenth. Whether these variations as to the year of Paul's suffering be accidental or intentional, they show in any case that the event occurred in the last years of Nero, and, therefore, favor the assumption of a period rather than a year of persecution.

According to Zahn² Eusebius cannot intend to give the definite year of the death of the Apostle, because he places the accession of Peter's successor in the year before Peter's death.³ Now Light-foot⁴ shows that in our present text of the Chronicon transpositions of events are numerous, owing to the uncertainty of reference to their respective years. "Of these transpositions," the writer continues, "we have an example in the martyrdom of St. Peter and the accession of Linus, which two events in the Armenian version . . . are placed in two successive years. In the Hieronymian version, on the other hand, they are in the reverse order and in the same year."

Finally, the exception of Harnack⁵ that the Chronicon dates the death of the Apostles A. D. 67, on account of the legend of Peter's twenty-five years' residence in Rome, loses its force when one considers that in the Armenian version only twenty years are expressly assigned to the Apostle's Roman ministry.⁶ But even supposing that the Hieronymian and Syriac texts of the Chronicon, in which twenty-five years are set aside for this period,⁷ present the original form, there is no proof that in the early church the number twenty-five was regarded as more sacred than the number twenty; and,

¹ Haer. 27, 6. ² Einleit i., p. 453. ³ Abraham 2082 or A. D. 66: Romanæ ecclesiæ post Petrum episcopatum excepit Linus annis xiv. ⁴ Clement i., p. 229 f. ⁵ Chronologie, p. 241. ⁶ Ann. Abraham 2055: Petrus apostolus cum primum Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset, Romanorum urbem proficiscitur ibique evangelium prædicat et commoratur illic antistes ecclesiæ annis xx. ⁷ Jerome's text: Ann. Abraham 2058: "Petrus apostolus cum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset. Romam mittitur, ubi evangelium prædicans xxv. annis eiusdem urbis episcopus perseverat."

therefore, if there be question of starting a legend, the one would prove as serviceable as the other. The originators, therefore, of Harnack's so-called legend concerning the duration of Peter's Roman ministry must have been led to choose the number twenty-five by reasons quite distinct from the mere fancy of the number; and unless Professor Harnack gives a more satisfactory explanation of their choice, we believe it has directed by the objective reality of historic facts.

After all that has been said, it seems almost useless to add the testimony of Cyril of Jerusalem,¹ Epiphanius,² Ephrem,³ Chrysostom,⁴ Theodoret,⁵ the author of the *Acta Xanthippæ et Polyxenæ*.⁶ In some passages Jerome speaks rather indefinitely of Paul's journey to the west,⁷ in others he reports the opinion of the Nazarenes,⁸ who see in Paul's western labors a fulfilment of prophecy, in others again he plainly expresses his own opinion: *Ad Italiam quoque et, ut ipse scribit, ad Hispanias alienigenarum portatus est navibus*.⁹ Even if the letters of Innocent I. (A. D. 416)¹⁰ and Gelasius (A. D. 495)¹¹ contained all they are said to contain by our opponents, their testimony could avail nothing against the consensus of tradition prior to their age and its revival in the writings of Gregory¹² and Isidore of Seville.¹³ But though Innocent may deny that Paul founded in Spain a church independently of Peter, and though Gelasius draws attention to the fact that Paul could not go to Spain as he had intended to go, neither of these writers explicitly excludes Paul's ministry in Spain, and much less a mere visit to the extreme west.

Returning now to the three questions proposed in the beginning of this paper, we are justified in maintaining that Paul was set free after the two years' detention mentioned in the Book of Acts. Moreover, since the whole drift of tradition points rather to A. D. 67 than A. D. 64 as the year of the Apostle's martyrdom, we must maintain that the Apostle's double Roman imprisonment agrees rather with the dates of the Old Pauline Chronology than with those of the New. Finally, as to the events intervening between the Apostle's two imprisonments, he must have set out for Spain in A. D. 64 (or A. D. 65); here he appears to have remained only a short time, a year at most. Returning to the east, he visited Crete, and then began the various visits of the churches of Asia, Greece and Macedonia, which we have enumerated in this paper.

¹ Cat. xvii., 26; cf. cat. xviii., 9. ² Hær. 26, 7. ³ *Expositio ev. concord.* 286: *Paulus ab urbe Jerusalem usque ad Hispaniam (prædicavit.)* ⁴ *De laud. Pauli*, hom. 7; *Act. apost. hom.* 55; *II. Tim. hom.* 10; *Epist. Hebr. hypoth.* Montfaucon ii. 516; ix., 414; xi., 724; xii., 2. ⁵ *Phil. i.*, 25; *II. Tim. iv.*, 17. ⁶ Cf. *Apocrypha anecd.* ed. James, 1893, pp. 58-85. ⁷ *Vir. iii.*, 5: *in occidentis partibus*. ⁸ *Comment. in Is. viii.*, 23; ix., 1. ⁹ *Comm. in Is. xi.* ¹⁰ *Epist.* 25, 2. ¹¹ *Epist.* 30, 11; ed. Thiel i., 444. ¹² *Moral.* xxxi., 103. ¹³ *De ortu et obitu patrum*, c. 69, ed. Arevalus v., 181.

In Corinth he met Peter, and the two Apostles went to Rome together¹, where they sealed their faith with their blood.

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE PHILIPPINE FRIARS AS MISSIONERS.

FROM the earliest settlement of the Philippines those islands have been regarded by the Spanish religious orders as a mission centre for the conversion of Eastern Asia. The work of the Philippine friars has not been confined to the territories under Spanish rule. Japan, China, Siam, Cambodia, Cochin China and Tonquin have continued to receive missionary priests from the Spanish colony since the sixteenth century. Three hundred years ago Franciscans from Manila furnished the first martyrs of Japan, and more than a century afterwards it was claimed for the central house of the order in that city that it never had failed to have some members destined to give their lives for the faith. At the present time the Augustinians and the Dominicans of the Philippines have charge of dioceses in China, and the Dominicans have charge of two in Tonquin. In neither have the missionaries the support of governmental influence, yet they have built up populations of thousands of practical Catholics among the natives. A sketch of the Dominican mission in Tonquin during the last sixty years will give a better idea of what kind of men the Spanish friars really are and what kind of Christians they have formed from the Asiatic races than any arguments.

Tonquin and Cochin China, which during the last century were united into the Kingdom of Annam, were visited by Spanish missionaries three hundred years ago. The number of converts was large enough in 1663 to warrant the establishment of two dioceses. One, Eastern Tonquin, was placed by the Holy See under the management of the Philippine Dominicans; the other was entrusted to the French Congregation of Foreign Missions. The work of both French and Spanish missionaries was the same in character and in results. In spite of the hostility, or, at best, the contemptuous toleration of the native governments, a Christian population of nearly four hundred thousand had been formed in Annam by the early part of the present century. In 1835 the Dominicans of Eastern Tonquin reckoned a hundred and eighty thousand Catholic natives in their charge. They had formed a native clergy both

¹ Dionys. Cor.; cf. Eus. H. E. ii., 24.

secular and Dominican, had established two seminaries, more than twenty-five convents and a large organization of lay teachers. The first twenty-five years of the century were a time of peace for the Catholics of Tonquin. The King, Gia Long, was favorable to Europeans and admired the Christian doctrines, even if he did not follow them. French officers were employed to discipline his army, and a French Bishop, Mgr. Pigneaux, was for many years his most trusted counsellor in the administration of government. On the death of Bishop Pigneaux, in 1799, he was buried with almost royal honors, and his burial place was reckoned among the chief monuments of the Annamite capital. The Catholic population was allowed the fullest liberty of worship, and it increased rapidly, especially among the country people.

Gia Long died in 1818, and under his son, Min Men, a reaction against European ways and Christianity set in. Min Men was an Asiatic Conservative, violent in temper and despotic in rule. He looked to China, not to Europe, as the model of government and civilization, and he tried to make a smaller China of Annam. He revived the idolatrous rites and required his Christian subjects to join in them in spite of the exemptions granted by his father. After several years of petty persecutions an edict was issued in 1835 forbidding absolutely the practice of the Catholic religion in Annam and ordering all the European missionaries to leave the country under penalty of death. There were at the time four Bishops and about twenty-five European priests in Annam. Bishop Cuenot, with ten French and thirty native priests, was charged with the vicariate of Cochin China, the Catholic population of which was about eighty thousand. Bishop Havard had ten French missionaries and eighty Annamite priests in the western diocese of Tonquin. The diocese of Eastern Tonquin was administered by the venerable Bishop Delgado since 1794. His coadjutor, Mgr. Henares, had been consecrated Bishop in 1800, and both were approaching their 80th year, but still active in their duties. Five Spanish and thirty native Dominican priests, with about twenty secular priests, all natives, made up the clergy of the Spanish diocese, which numbered nearly two hundred thousand Catholics.

A French missionary in Cochin China, Father Marchand, was the first victim of the Asiatic Kulturkampf. He was arrested while traveling from one Christian village to another, and ordered to abandon his religion publicly, in obedience to the edicts of Min Men. On his refusal he was beheaded in 1835. Two years later Father Cornay, a young priest of 30, met the same fate in Tonquin. Annam at the time, like China and Japan, was completely shut against European intercourse of any kind. The executions of the

two French priests passed unnoticed in Europe, and Min Men proceeded to carry out his plans for the destruction of Christianity within his dominions. A formal test of apostacy was decreed, modeled on the practice of the Japanese Shoguns. Any one suspected of professing the Christian faith might be directed to trample on a cross in public. On the 18th of March, 1838, an attempt was made to enforce this test on the whole population of Eastern Tonquin. Crosses were placed in the streets at the entrances to all the towns and markets and police officers stationed to oblige every one to walk on them as a sign of conformity with the religion of the State. Some Christians yielded; others were arrested and flogged, Chinese fashion, or heavily fined. A general feeling of agitation developed itself through the provinces where the Christians were numerous, and the officials, after a few days, thought it wise to give up the attempt to enforce wholesale apostacy.

It was not that Min Men had any idea of relaxing his war against Christianity, however. The provincial Governors were ordered to spare no pains to discover any Europeans who might be in the country and arrest them all. A native who was carrying letters to the Spanish missioners was arrested by chance. The Governor forwarded them to the King and got a characteristic answer. Min Men deprived him of his government and sentenced him to death unless he could capture the four Spanish missioners to whom the letters were addressed within a month. He was allowed six thousand soldiers and several vessels to carry out the task. The Spanish diocese was at once overrun by spies, and a clue was found to the residence of Bishop Delgado, who with his coadjutor and another Dominican, Father Ximenes, were hidden in a remote village. It was suddenly surrounded by troops. Father Ximenes, an active young man, succeeded in slipping through the soldiers on foot. The old Bishops were unable to do the same. The native Catholics put them into covered baskets and carried them to other villages. The bearers of Bishop Henares succeeded in reaching a fishing settlement some miles away, but it was only to have him seized there within three days. Bishop Delgado was captured in the village itself. Both were put into wooden coops just large enough to admit their bodies and carried in this fashion to the Governor. He sent the news of the arrests to the King, and by his order the two Bishops were brought before the Annamite Judges and cross-examined as to their character, the number of priests in the country and their places of abode. The sentence finally passed on Bishop Delgado is given in a letter of Father Hermosilla, the provincial of the Dominicans in Tonquin, to his superiors in Manila, written early in 1839, while the persecution was still going on.

The reasons for the sentence given by the Annamite Judges at that time have a remarkable likeness to some used against the Catholic Church during recent persecutions in Europe.

"It is in obedience to the law," wrote the Asiatic Judges, "that we condemn the Bishop Ignatius. This foreigner spends his life in the study of the human heart and meditation on things incomprehensible. He is chief of the dangerous men who are spreading a false religion among us, and when brought before the court he refuses to give the information asked of him. Having read, then, with submission the decree of the seventeenth year of Min Men the King (1835), which says, 'We order all Mayors of towns and villages to arrest Europeans wherever they find them, and hand them over to the Judges to be tried, according to the laws against such as seduce the people by teaching a foreign and false religion.' And whereas there is also a law against enchanterers, and that under the name of enchanterers are included those who induce by trickery the people to follow false worships, we pronounce that such is the offense of this criminal, and that by law he is liable to hanging. But to proportion the punishment better to the crime, and to give a warning to the people, we order that Ignatius Trum Ca, here present, be beheaded and his head exposed in the public market."

The sentence passed on Bishop Henares was similar to that of Bishop Delgado. A Catholic teacher arrested in his company received a special sentence.

"Von Chien, a native of Tonquin, convicted of having been led astray by a European criminal and of having adopted his religion, in defiance of the law forbidding it, persists in refusing to abandon it, and says he loves it. His obstinacy makes him guilty of rebellion against the King and the laws of the country, and we sentence him accordingly to execution by beheading."

The Bishops had companions in their martyrdom. Father Fernandez, the Vicar General, and a native priest, Father Tuan, were captured a few days later and shared the same prison. Father Fernandez was offered life and transportation out of Annam if he would renounce his faith, and Father Tuan was offered official favor on the same terms. Both refused and got the same sentence, death by beheading. The sentences, as each was given by the Annamite Judges, were sent to the capital for approval or modification by the King in person. Meanwhile the Spanish Bishops and priests were kept in their narrow wooden cages in the common jail and the native priests and others in other cages with bamboo cages, a bucket-shaped case open at the top, on their shoulders. The sentences came back after some days with the approval of Min

Men; but in the interval Bishop Delgado and Father Tuan both died in prison. Torture and starvation were more speedy than the sword. To carry out the sentence passed, the body of Bishop Delgado was beheaded after death and the head exposed in the market place. He had been Bishop of Tonquin forty-four years, his coadjutor thirty-eight. His vicar general was thirty-three years on the same mission. Father Hermosilla describes the last scene in words which have a strange force from one who had shared in the work of the martyrs for nine years and was at the time exposed to their fate from day to day. He writes:

"The sentences of the Bishop Henares and the teacher were sent back from Hae on the 25th of June, with orders to execute them at once. At 9 in the morning they were led to martyrdom, escorted by soldiers and followed by crowds, both of Christians and infidels. The Bishop in his cage prayed with the utmost composure. He was followed by the teacher on foot carrying the cangue on his shoulders and fettered. An official went before and made proclamation on each street: 'Know all that this man is a European sentenced to death for preaching the false religion of Christ. Avoid that doctrine if you would escape a like fate.'

"After four hours the procession reached the place of execution. The teacher knelt down, and having recommended his soul to God with holy joy, had his head struck off. Meantime the Bishop was let out of his cage. He, too, knelt down and continued to pray with perfect calm, though the axe was raised over his neck. Unsullied purity of life, untireable zeal for the salvation of souls, entire devotion to his apostolic duties, with a keen desire of martyrdom, such were the virtues of which he constantly gave us the example. He was also remarkable for his perseverance in prayer, his study of the Fathers and unbounded love for the poor. He died at the age of 73, forty-nine years of which he devoted to the good of the mission."

Father Fernandez, the vicar general, was the next to suffer. On the 24th of July he was brought for the last time before the Governor, who offered him pardon and the means to return to Europe if he would trample on the cross. The missionary declared he was ready to die for the God whom they wished to outrage. He was at once carried to the place of execution, being worn so much with illness that he could not move. When placed on his knees for execution he had to be held up by a soldier to receive the sword stroke which ended his life. Father Vincent Yen, a native Dominican, had been executed on the 2d of June.

An old priest of 84, Father Bernard, followed the Spanish martyrs to death on the 1st of August, and two Dominicans, also natives, were executed on the 5th of September. Five laymen were sen-

tenced to death at the same time, but had not been executed at the date of Father Hermosilla's report. All the native Christians were not equally steadfast. "Would I could say the same," he continues, "of Vincent Yen, a secular priest, 87 years of age. To save a few days of life he trampled on the cross of his Divine Master and signed a written renunciation of his faith. The faithful have been terror-stricken and all the priests are covered with shame at his apostacy. When set free he felt himself the enormity of his crime and wrote to me asking penance and absolution. I consoled him as best I could, but reparation had to be made for the scandal he had given, and I have therefore suspended him from saying Mass or administering the sacraments. I must say, to his praise, that he submitted to this punishment with the most edifying humility."

It would be hard to find a more characteristic expression of the spirit which actuated the Catholic missionaries than these words. The horror for the offense, the simple faith in the future life which makes the writer wonder how any one could betray his conscience for a few years on earth, the shame of the colleagues of the sinner and the kindly pity for himself, the sentence of suspension passed by one whose own life was forfeited to the law on another in the same condition, and the humble submission of the repentant priest of nearly 90, form a picture which can scarcely be paralleled. It is noteworthy that the Dominican prelate while praising the "edifying humility" of the repentant priest, makes no allusion to the weakness which might accompany 87 years. Duty with him can never be subordinate to human weakness. No American non-Catholic would give a thought to any feeling except pity for a man of over 80 who happened to lie when confronted with a pistol. Father Hermosilla felt simply that man's duty only ends with his life. He had before him the example of his Bishops and of the old native priests just gone to their reward to prove that his view was the true one.

The conclusion of this remarkable letter sums up in simple language the state of the Catholics of Tonquin sixty years ago:

"So many Christians executed were so many steps to restore to the Governor Trin Quan Can the King's favor. His province, one of the most important and the centre of Christianity in Tonquin, has again fallen under his yoke. In many places the Catholic people have been required to trample on the cross and sign a promise not to follow the Christian religion. Many have refused or bribed the officials not to trouble them. The faith of others has been put to hard trials and they have had the glory to confess Jesus Christ in chains and tortures. How many tears must be shed

over the number who have had the weakness to yield to the will of the Prince. . . .

"The houses of the priests are destroyed, two colleges, twenty-two convents of nuns of the third order and three convents of the 'Daughters of the Cross' have shared the same fate. These poor women continue their community life, however, sheltered in poor huts. The property of the churches, of the poor, of the Bishop have been seized by pagans or bad Christians. Chalices, vestments, missals, breviaries, other pious books, almost all have gone. The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.

"When peace is restored," he hopefully adds, "my first care will be to restore the colleges, that the youth may not lack the benefit of a religious education. I look on this as of the utmost importance. At present all our priests, but especially the Europeans, have to hide in the most secret places. Our teachers and students cannot be gathered together anywhere for fear of new rigor."

"Deeds, not words," was the motto of the famous Seminary of St. Omer during its two centuries of existence as the support of the Church in persecuting England and persecuted Ireland. Deeds, not words, was the thought of the friars of Tonquin in our own day.

The outlook was in truth as gloomy as it well could be from a human point of view. When Father Hermosilla wrote his report there was no Bishop left in Tonquin. The Spanish prelates had been beheaded, and ten days later Bishop Havard, of Western Tonquin, died of fever. He had been driven by the persecution to hide in a cave in the fever-infested jungles, and for sixteen days he lived there alone, with no food but a little cold rice brought to him by some native women from time to time. The fever caught him, and feeling the end near he walked back to the nearest Catholic village and there lay down and died without a friend near. Father Borie, a young missionary of remarkable talents, had just been selected as his coadjutor, but before he could be consecrated he was arrested, and after months of torture executed in the capital of Annam. Father Retord, a veteran missionary, received the nomination of the Holy See to the western diocese on the death of Father Borie, and Father Hermosilla to the eastern, but there was no means of getting episcopal consecration in Tonquin. Father Retord, it was decided, should go to Manila to look for a Bishop for that purpose, and meanwhile Father Hermosilla should attend to the administration of the Church in Tonquin. It is hard to say which had the more dangerous task.

Father Retord was six months in finding a vessel that would take the risk of carrying him to China, and then, when he was car-

ried alongside it in a fishing boat, the captain changed his mind and refused to take him. Several months passed before another Chinese vessel carried him to Macao. He was smuggled on board in the neighborhood of two Annamite revenue junks which were watching the coast to prevent the escape of Christians. The junk was manned by heathen Chinese, and among them the Bishop-elect had to spend forty-six days in a coasting voyage to Macao. The misery of such an experience for a solitary European may be imagined, but in his letters Father Retord described those days as the pleasantest of his eighty years' life in the mission of Tonquin. At Macao he felt, as he said himself, like a fish thrown from the sand into the water. To speak freely with friends, to walk publicly in the streets, even to hear a church bell, were all enjoyments he had not known for eight long years. At Macao he was offered a passage to Europe for a much-needed rest, but he could not think of leaving the persecuted Catholics of Tonquin. He got to Manila and was consecrated by the Archbishop on the 29th of May, 1840, nearly two years after the death of his predecessor, Bishop Havard. By a remarkable coincidence, on the following day the Governor Trin Quan Can made a sudden raid on a Catholic village in Bishop Retord's diocese and captured three native priests, who were all beheaded, after months of torture, before the new Bishop's return. It was as hard to return to Tonquin as it had been to leave it. Finally a Chinese junk offered to carry the Bishop and three priests to Tonquin for sixteen hundred dollars. They sailed from Macao on the 3d of January and reached the part of the coast where the Bishop proposed to land, among some Catholic fishing villages, in eleven days; but only to find several revenue cutters on the watch for smugglers. After laying off for three days a fishing junk from a Catholic village came to meet them and took the Bishop and his priests, one of them a Spanish Dominican, the others Frenchmen, ashore at a remote part of the coast. They made their way by night to a village known already to the Bishop, but only to find it had just been raided and its native priest arrested a few days before. A few hours for sleep, after three nights' wakefulness, was all the stay they dared to make, and after another night march they got to a village which had escaped the notice of the persecutors and were able to rest a few days. Father Berneux described his abode here as a bamboo hut, in which he could walk six steps and get light from a hole near the ground during the day. He could not leave it with safety, or even raise his voice, except at night. Leaving him in this abode, Bishop Retord traveled in similar fashion to his episcopal palace in another village, where he sent word for Father Hermosilla to come and receive consecration as soon as possible.

In Tonquin during Bishop Retord's absence the persecution had continued unabated. Besides the three priests already mentioned, several others and some teachers and other laymen had been executed during these two years. The King Min Men died at the beginning of 1841, just as Bishop Retord landed. His death had no immediate effect in slackening the Asiatic Kulturkampf against the Church. Just as Father Hermosilla reached Bishop Retord to receive consecration a body of seven hundred soldiers made a descent on the neighboring Catholic villages and arrested Fathers Galy and Berneaux, the two newly-arrived priests. The capture was made on Easter Sunday, after they had said their Masses, and the troops continued to hunt for priests. It was under these circumstances that Father Hermosilla was raised to the episcopacy three days afterwards. There was little of pomp or noise around the ceremony, and when it was over the new Bishop traveled back to his diocese under cover of night. He immediately consecrated as his coadjutor Father Ximenes, who had been with Bishop Delgado at the time of his arrest. Bishop Retord also consecrated a coadjutor. It is necessary here, he wrote to a friend in France, for a Bishop to anoint another head with the Holy Chrism, for there is no telling how soon his own may be removed from his shoulders.

Three more missionaries were captured during the year, and all five sentenced to death and confined in the prisons of the capital. The lash and other tortures were meantime freely used on all five. Bishop Retord ordained no less than eleven and his coadjutor two priests during the same time. By the middle of 1842 he had almost exactly as many priests as at the beginning of Min Men's persecution.

" Each stepping where his comrade stood
The instant that he fell."

The number of converts was very remarkable at the same time. A respite was given to the persecution, though the laws against Christianity remained. Trin Quan Can was disgraced by the new King and removed from office. In the following year, 1843, Bishop Hermosilla received eight pagan villages into instruction and baptized ninety-six converts himself in two days. He also visited most of the Catholic villages and confirmed several thousand who had been unable to see a Bishop for many years.

The promise made in his report of the deaths of Bishops Delgado and Henares, to restore the two colleges, was speedily fulfilled. They were refounded in other districts in 1841, the year of his consecration, and before May of 1844 twelve native priests had been ordained from their students, the same number as had been executed. The provincial of the Dominicans in a report to the General

of his Order stated that there were in 1844 thirty native Dominican and eighteen native secular priests, with six Spanish friars, in the diocese. There were eight students of theology and twenty of Latin in the colleges, but it took a long time to fit the native candidates for ordination. In addition every priest on the mission was training some boys at his own house in Chinese literature and Latin preparatory to entering the seminaries. The twenty-five convents destroyed by Min Men had all been restored. The Catholic population, the provincial added, had grown both in numbers and fervor under the persecution. The administration of the sacraments was equal to the times of peace. Two native priests were arrested and sentenced to death for the faith during the year, but Father Marti considered that everything was going on rather peaceably. The amount of peace asked by Spanish friars on mission work was evidently not extravagant.

A letter from another friar, Father Barcelo, in the same year, gives a good idea of the kind of work that made up a missionary's life in Tonquin. Father Barcelo was called to Macao to act as procurator in the end of 1843, and he thus describes his voyage:

"Our vessel was manned by Christians and accompanied by two junks loaded with rice and manned by heathens. After three days we were becalmed near the residence of the Governor and boarded by some customs vessels, with the Governor's secretary on board one. I had no resource but to sit down covered with all the old clothes of the sailors, so that I was nearly smothered. Our visitors came aboard and stopped to dine on our vessel. The secretary took an after-dinner siesta of a couple of hours by my side, but they left without suspecting there was a missionary on board. On the 4th of December we reached Fu, the first town of Chinese territory. Five Catholic villages near it had been two years without seeing a priest and I had orders to attend to them. They came in crowds to confess, and the mothers brought their children for baptism. Being deeply affected by their fervor, I remained three days and nights without sleep to hear their confessions. As far as regards myself, the work was amply repaid. I baptized ninety-nine persons, grown-up and infants, gave seventeen extreme unction, heard a thousand and thirty-six confessions and administered communion to over a thousand persons. Among the penitents were four or five village Mayors, the second official of Canton and the secretary of the Cantonal prefect.

"To get away from Fu I had to buy a boat, which I offered for a passage to Macao. It was small and leaky, as you may guess when I say I got it, with the rigging, for fifty dollars. I sailed in it, however, with seven Chinese and three Annamite sailors all

crowded together. On the third day we were boarded by three pirate junks. Our money, our provisions and fresh water, even some planks of our vessel, were carried off. What pained me most was to see the correspondence of the Bishops and missioners fall into these hands. I begged the pirates to return my breviary, which could be of no use to them, but one of them was so indignant that he seized his sword to kill me, and I had to slip under the deck to escape.

"Our journey lasted seven days longer. Having no protection against the cold, no provisions but a little rice mixed with some half-rotten fish and a little water full of dirt and sprinkled with brine, our company offered a sad picture; but, thank God, we reached Macao on Good Friday."

Here is another picture of the mission life of a Philippine friar in the Chinese Diocese of Fo Kien during a time of peace. Bishop Guillemin, of Canton, gave it in a report to the Seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris in 1860:

"At Amoy, confided to the care of the Spanish Dominicans, we saw the fine church which is being built by the missioner. This exemplary priest, who is dying of consumption, is spending the last remnant of strength in building a temple to the true God on this infidel soil. Though well aware of his condition, he thinks he may have time to finish his work. 'And then,' he says, 'my race will be run and I will ask the Lord to give me a low place in his heavenly temple.'

"We went twelve leagues into the interior to visit a congregation of five or six hundred converts. We did not get there till midnight, and the priest was away, but some young people in charge of the house received us with cordiality. After Mass at 6 in the morning we were going to take breakfast when we found the missioner himself had come. He had walked several miles during the night to meet us. His hair and beard are gray, though he is only 45. In his face and bearing there is an air of simple dignity, and at the same time gentle cheerfulness which struck my companions. We were more surprised when we saw this worthy disciple of St. Dominic, after his fatigue, not only not touching meat, as the ordinary rule of his order requires, but taking for all food a dish of corn and eggs, washed down with a few cups of tea, his only beverage. Such has been his diet during the twenty-four years he has spent on the mission."

A strange contrast these pictures to those given by so many scribblers in our own press of the "lazy and greedy friars" of the Philippines.

During the reign of Min Men's successor, which lasted till the

end of 1847, the Dominicans in Tonquin were comparatively in peace. The laws against Christianity remained in force and some native priests were executed in accordance with them; but after the experience of Min Men's persecution the missionaries regarded themselves as happy to have so little to suffer. When Tu Duc became King, in 1848, new decrees were published against the Catholics. The text of the edict ran thus:

"The religion of Jesus, which has been outlawed by the last two Kings, is evidently a perverse religion, for in it they do not honor their dead parents; they tear out the eyes of the dying to make magic potions, and besides they practise many superstitions.

"Consequently, the Europeans who teach this religion, being the most culpable, they are to be thrown into the sea with stones tied around their necks. A reward of three hundred taels (six hundred dollars) will be paid to whoever arrests a European teacher.

"The Annamite priests shall be tortured to make them give up their religion. If they refuse to give it up, they are to be branded on the face and banished to the most unhealthy places in the mountains.

"As the common Christians who won't give up their religion are mostly poor idiots and weak-minded creatures, the King in his benevolence does not condemn them to death or exile. The judges shall flog them and then let them go."

This remarkable edict, however, did not lead to the capture of any Europeans for some years. The five French priests sentenced to execution in 1842 had been released a year after on the demand of a French naval captain, and the Annamite Government did not care to risk a second experience of the same kind. The Catholic population continued to increase. In 1845 Bishop Hermosilla returned the Catholics in his diocese at nearly two hundred thousand, four hundred and sixty-five converts having been added during that year. There were over a hundred and fifty thousand confessions and a hundred and thirty-three thousand communions. The number of dioceses in Annam had been increased from three to seven between 1838 and 1852. In Tonquin the Dominicans had charge of the eastern and central vicariates, the Society of Foreign Missions the western and southern. In 1852 Bishop Retord thus summed up the growth of the Catholic Church in his diocese during fourteen years of proscription: "There were seventy-five priests in Western Tonquin at the death of Bishop Havard, and they had been reduced to fifty at the time of my ordination. There are now a hundred and eight. We have thirty-three students in theology and two hundred and forty in Latin in the two colleges, and eight hundred pupils in thirty-eight boarding schools attached to the

parishes. We have nearly five hundred Sisters, and the Catholics have increased about forty thousand in eleven years."

It is in the face of facts like these that lecturers in the United States speak of the Philippine friars as "exacting marriage fees which compelled the natives to live in immorality, and burial fees which obliged them to leave the bodies of the poor unburied."

A storm was to break over the Catholics of Tonquin which made even the persecution of Min Men appear a time of comparative peace. France tried to open relations with the Annamites in 1856, as she had already done with China, but Tu Duc refused any communication with the European "savages." The vessel which brought the proposition was not even allowed to take provisions at the port of Touranne, and a collision followed, in which the forts of that place were destroyed by the French guns. Two years afterwards a joint Franco-Spanish squadron came to demand satisfaction for various injuries received from the Annamite Court. They occupied Touranne and a war began which lasted until 1862. These four years were a period of destruction for the Annamite Catholics. The King launched decree after decree against their religion and themselves. The soldiers of the army were all ordered to clear themselves of suspicion of Christianity by joining in sacrifices to the ancestors and trampling on crosses. At the capital in 1858 a hundred and three refused these tests and were at once put in fetters and employed on cleaning the drains of the city pending further punishment. Crosses were laid on the ground at every gate of the city, and all passers were obliged by police officers to trample on them. A Catholic captain was beheaded for refusing to give up his religion, and fifteen others were sentenced to banishment. The next year the persecution was terribly increased. Crosses were laid in many country villages as well as in the cities, and the Catholics were arrested and imprisoned by dozens at a time. Fifteen priests, all natives, were executed and several hundred Catholics sent into exile this year in Cochin China alone. At the end of the year a new law ordered that all Catholic men throughout the country should be taken from their homes and sent as public prisoners to the pagan villages.

The next year was still worse. The whole Catholic population of several provinces was driven from its homes and the faces of the grown people branded with Chinese characters meaning "Infamous Religion." These were cut in with pieces of glass or pottery so that the scars might remain permanently. The Annamite governors and generals were left absolute freedom in dealing with the lives of the hated Christians. At Bien Ho, a city of Cochin China occupied by the French troops, the commander found the charred

bodies of three hundred native Catholics, men, women and children. They had been shut up before his approach in a wooden building, and when the Governor retreated he first had the building fired, and stationed guards around it to throw back any of the prisoners that forced their way out of the flames. In another city of Central Tonquin the Viceroy shut up three hundred in a prison and starved them all to death. The same official made a circuit afterwards of the Christian villages and beheaded all who refused to renounce their faith. On the 18th of May, 1861, he executed twenty-one thus, forty-three on the 22d of the same month, sixty-seven on the 26th and as many on the 27th. Two hundred and twenty-four Catholics still remained in confinement, and on the last days of May they were tied hand and foot and thrown into the river. In all the number only three consented to abandon their religion. So much for the Christianity taught by the Spanish friars, which is so glibly described as nominal by American lecturers.

One case deserves mention. A man of thirty-five after being kept some months in prison and repeatedly flogged, had his face branded with the Chinese letters, "False religion of Jesus." When returned to his prison he got a fellow captive to cut out the flesh on which "False religion" was marked, leaving only the sacred name. He was flogged unmercifully and then sentenced to execution unless he would allow the effaced words to be branded on again. On his refusal he was immediately beheaded.

In another place the Viceroy already mentioned had over two hundred prisoners thrown into a pit and covered it with planks. The living and dead were left together till the end slowly came to the last sufferer. The list of butcheries given by Father Estevez, a Spanish Dominican, who remained in Tonquin through all these horrors, may well make us think that Christian courage is not the gift of any special race. Writing on the 8th of July to his superiors in Manila, he says: "On the 20th of last month fifty-three Christians were executed in the capital of the southern province. Five days earlier the Prefect of Chan Din ordered two hundred to be drowned together. Forty-one were saved by the people living on the river. Five of these came to see me a few days since and gave me an account of the event."

He continues the list of executions thus: "In the chief town of San, fifty-six Christians were beheaded on the 27th and 30th of May. Ninety-six suffered the same fate at Chan Din. At Quin Co a number (we have not learned exactly how many) were imprisoned, fire set to the building and all perished. At Doi Yen a hundred and fifty were collected for execution together. The bungling executioners, after having fearfully mangled twenty, lost

patience and drove the whole body into the river. In the midst of this massacre," he adds, "it is most consoling for God's servants to know that amongst the thousands of confessors only *six apostates* have been found." We fear the test would hardly give the same result in our own land.

The summing up given by Father Estevez is as follows: "With regard to the number who have perished I shall only state that in one vicariate alone, Central Tonquin, the multitude of victims has, it is well known, reached the figure of sixteen thousand. Some say, perhaps with reason, that twice that number have perished. (The census of 1856 numbered the Catholics at a hundred and fifty-five thousand.) In the capital alone of the upper province five thousand have suffered. Widows and orphans are met with in crowds on all sides. Possibly," he adds, with scrupulosity, in a note, "some inaccuracies may have crept into my letter, for we have not been able to verify everything ourselves. If so, I shall hasten to correct them as soon as accurate information is obtained."

How, it may be asked, did the clergy fare if such was the fate of the common Catholic population? Father Estevez tells this with simple force: "During the last five years we have lost three Bishops, thirty-six priests and the vicar general. Twenty-eight native priests were executed. Through the whole mission we have now only twelve native ecclesiastics, and three of these invalided. Of the seven hundred students and scholars in the parish seminaries very few remain. Exile and the scaffold have disposed of the rest. And, thank God, out of so many, two-thirds of whom have undergone the torture in the courts, only six have fallen, and of these some have already made reparation and confessed the faith again."

It will be remembered that Father Hermosilla in his report of the martyrdom of his predecessor in the episcopate promised to give his first care to restoring the ruined seminaries of Tonquin. How faithfully he had kept his promise this report of his own successor tells in the very middle of the carnage of a new persecution. There was no tale of apostacy to lessen the glory of the generation of priests trained up by the Dominican missionary Bishop. They proved their faith by deeds, not words.

Bishop Hermosilla's own end is told in the same report of Father Estevez. He had been driven from one hiding place to another for three years, and when the Catholic villages were destroyed in 1860 he found no asylum but a native river junk. The Bishop of Central Tonquin, Mgr. Ochoa, and Father Almato, a veteran Dominican missionary, hid themselves in another boat. All three were captured in October, 1861, near Hai Duong, the capital of a province. They were marched there on foot, examined before the Annamite courts

and then shut up in wooden cages, exactly as Bishop Delgado and his coadjutor twenty-three years before. As Bishop Hermosilla had then described the end of his predecessor we will let Father Estevez tell his own:

"The feast of All Saints, the thirty-first anniversary of my companion's novitiate (Father Almato had been fellow novice of Father Estevez) was the day chosen for the triumph of the three apostles. When it was known they were to be executed a crowd assembled and followed to the fatal spot. Two elephants led the funeral procession and four companies of infantry followed in line. The three cages of the confessors were surrounded by soldiers. In the first was Father Almato, bent down, his rosary in his hands, praying to her who had so well preserved his innocence. In the second cage was our venerable Bishop Ochoa, absorbed in deep meditation, which practice had long made familiar to him. The Bishop of Western Tonquin, Hermosilla, was seated in the third cage, as if on a throne. He kept blessing the people around him.

At the place of execution the cages were opened, the confessors knelt down and Mgr. Hermosilla asked a few minutes for prayer, which was granted.

"It was a touching sight to witness the silence of the crowd while the three prayed with eyes lifted to heaven, offering the sacrifice of their lives to their Creator.

"The prayer finished, Mgr. Hermosilla told the commander they were ready. Their arms were then bound behind their backs and their bodies tied to stakes so tightly that their chests were swollen and their necks stretched as if in suffocation. The voice of a trumpeter then ordered the soldiers to stand at attention and arrest any one who should show sympathy with the martyrs. The poor trumpeter had tears running down his cheeks while proclaiming this order; he was himself a Christian. At the third stroke of a gong three swords fell on the three heads, which rolled on the ground, the first at one stroke, the others at the second. The bodies were left on the spot for twenty-four hours, while the heads were fixed on posts and exposed there for three days. A little later the relics were bought at a high price by our Christians and buried with all secrecy at dead of night."

Compare this account of the close of a missionary's career with that of his predecessor, Bishop Henares, twenty-three years earlier, which we have already given, and then let who will talk of the degeneracy of the religious orders in Spanish lands. Bishop Ochoa was only 34 years of age. He came to give his life to the conversion of Tonquin at the moment when the fiercest persecution broke out in 1858. Bishop Garcia at once selected him as his coadjutor

and consecrated him in June of that year. Eleven days later the consecrating prelate was beheaded himself. Five Bishops drawn from the same orders as the Philippine Friars have thus laid down their lives for the Catholic Faith within a quarter of a century. They are included among the forty-nine martyrs of Annam who have this year been solemnly declared such by Leo XIII. The men of any race who will undertake to give a higher type of Christianity to the Philippines must be bold indeed. One cannot help drawing a comparison between the English Bishops of the days of Henry VIII. and these Spanish Bishops of our own day.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco.

SOCIAL STANDPOINT IN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY.

THE principal matter of debate in the controversies of thirty years ago between Intuitionism and Empiricism was the attempt of the empiricists—from Hume to J. S. Mill—to deny to the mind the power of intuition, and to trace all our knowledge to sensible experience. The method used by the intuitionist in this controversy was that of individual self-analysis. He appealed to beliefs accepted as valid by intuitionist and empiricist alike; analyzed their logical basis; showed that this *must* include certain primary intuitions irreducible to experience. The empiricist was challenged to examine his own mind, to apply the intuitionist analysis and to show if he could that the conclusion was not inevitable—that the beliefs in question rested on intuitions. The crucial part of the process, on either side, was individual introspection. The case was decided by the verdict of accurate self-analysis. The standpoint on either side was that of the individual examining his own mind. The object of the present article is to show how a change has arisen in the standpoint from which these controversies are now regarded and the method employed in their solution; how the social method and social standpoint have come largely to supplement the individual.

Among the issues fought out on the old lines of controversy were the intuitive character of memory, the intuitive basis of necessary truth, the nature of the primary ethical perceptions. Huxley had traced our confidence in memory to our *experience* of its truthfulness. The intuitionist challenged him to analyze his own mind more accu-

rately. He could not even know that memory had been truthful without *first* trusting its own records of the past. Nor could any argument justify our trust in the most positive assertions of memory as to recent events. To *understand* an argument you must trust that memory which connects the first part of a sentence with the last. It is a condition of all coherent reasoning that the memory should be trusted. Our trust in it is therefore ultimate.

So, too, it was argued in the case of the empirical theory that belief in necessary truth is based on induction. You must necessarily admit that the belief that the truths of geometry obtain universally is more than an induction from experience, because to observe carefully one instance in which a trilateral figure is triangular proves to you that all trilaterals *must* be triangular.

Again, you must admit (it was argued) the simplicity of the idea of "moral worth"—that it is something distinct from the idea of "beneficial to the race" to which some of the older utilitarians reduced it—because you yourself must recognize that to say "what ever is beneficial to the race is good" is far from being the tautologous proposition "whatever is good is good."

So far (I repeat) each party appealed to the analysis of the individual mind—to instances in which mental experience is the same, and the only question is of true and false analysis; and the intuitionist claimed that by the inevitable confession of his antagonists his own analysis was shown on these points to be the true one. He claimed a victory, and set down as admitted first principles that our trust in memory is ultimate and intuitive; that the acceptance of necessary truths is not of the nature of an induction, but is intuitive, or derived from intuition; that the idea of moral worth is a simple idea, and not identical with "beneficial to the race," or with other suggested analyses of its import.

If the controversy ended here, if to show that Hume and the Mills had denied what the analysis of the human mind clearly establishes were tantamount to a philosophy of religion, it might be unnecessary to consider another standpoint. But this is not so.

The admission of certain axioms as primary, and even as known by intuition, does not necessarily involve the admission of all the axioms postulated in a Theistic philosophy. You may bring the empiricist, as Mill was brought, to admit memory as an ultimate means of knowledge, but he may stop short, as Mill did, at the intuition of causation. You may prove the inadequacy of "beneficial" as synonymous with "good;" but you still have before you subtler explanations of the ethical judgments, referring conscience to the early fear of father and ruler, or to the associations created early in life by punishment for a certain class of actions, or to the still

more complicated genesis suggested by the evolutionists. Again, the endeavor to connect the moral perceptions with knowledge of God may raise further questions in which no agreement can be obtained between the analyses of different thinkers. You may have won the admission that geometrical truth is necessary; but you have yet to win assent to the proposition that space is objective—that necessary truth is more than subjective consistency in the *a priori* elements which the mind brings with it as a condition of experience. And both the objective character of space and the objective validity of synthetic *a priori* judgments are important elements in more than one version of the philosophical basis of Theism.

And here arises the problem which first suggests what I have called the social standpoint at its narrowest angle of departure from the individual standpoint. Hitherto beliefs have been considered in which the decision of all minds is really similar, and in the case of which apparent differences are resolvable into a true and a false analysis of similar convictions. Thus a direct issue was possible from the individualistic standpoint. All men really trust their memories in certain cases, as an ultimate trust, assumed in the very attempt to offer proof that there are prior motives for the trust. All men really hold particular geometrical truths to obtain universally, on the examination of one instance, and not as in induction from many. Here the empiricists had simply failed in their analysis of experiences common to all.

But when we get to the further questions just referred to it is otherwise. Is the use of the causation argument for Theism valid? Does causation really involve more than succession? Does the human mind affirm with right the objective character of space? These questions are found to involve ultimate differences, not of analysis, but of first principles. Individualism comes to a deadlock. Its weapons no longer apply. Either we abandon all hope of agreement and end with the statement on either side that "orthodoxy is my doxy," or we make some attempt to trace the history of differences between mind and mind, hoping to discover their source, and thus to effect a reconciliation, or to join issue on a prior stage in the argument. We leave the study of the individual mind and take up the social standpoint.

The philosopher no longer merely analyzes his own mental experiences, treating this process as a final appeal, stating it that others may apply it to their own minds, and test how far it reveals defects in *their* analysis. He employs a different method. He questions his own most positive and ultimate convictions by comparing them with those of others. He looks on himself from outside, as a unit acted on by social influences; and questions the source

of the first principles he has accepted. He looks along the line of history to see if he can ascertain a reason for ultimate differences between one mind and another, and if that reason can throw any light on the question—which of the opposing first principles is right? He becomes provisionally a doubter, where he had been positive. The thinker who is thus hesitating between the two views (above referred to) concerning causation and space may undoubtedly learn something from tracing the history of the controversy between the empirical and the *a priori* schools. He may come to the conclusion that the early success of the empiricists was due to the fact that a dogmatic age had been too ready to multiply dogmatic first principles, which it was really beyond the power of the human mind lawfully to affirm; that the protest of Bacon, echoed by Locke, against the theorizing of the “*intellectus sibi permissus*” had in it a measure of obvious justice: that the subsequent reaction against empiricism was due to a similar exaggeration on the part of such empiricists as Hume, who, in their zeal to expose the false pretensions of the advocates of “innate ideas,” eventually denied to the mind powers which must really be assumed as valid in the simplest and most obvious reasoning processes—powers which can be justified by no external test, as the human mind has no test at its command which it can apply without using the very powers and processes whose validity is to be tested.

Here, in an instance I have chosen for its great simplicity, a glance at history does not reveal the *root* of divergence in first principles. Neither party was wholly right; yet both held a characteristic truth. The dogmatism of scholastic days and the caution bred by the rise of induction each formed a temper of mind which tended, one to exaggerate, the other to minimize, the power of the human faculties to rise above sensible knowledge. The individual who had been influenced by the maxims of either age had to correct his mind's spontaneous decision by allowing for the current.

Here it is at least possible that this slight historical survey may come to the aid of the enquirer, in such a deadlock as I have indicated between the views of Mill and of the intuitionists as to causation; or between the views of Kant and of his opponents as to the objective character of space. The thinker may come to the conclusion that the extensive dogmatism of mediæval philosophy, which tended to the exaggeration of the mind's powers of active perception, had led to a violent reaction, in which the analysis of passive impressions as the exclusive road to truth had become an intellectual fashion; that the sober common-sense of Locke had kept this tendency from extremes; but that Berkeley and Hume, each in his own way, had carried it so far as to question all active elements in men-

tal perception. This extreme had in it (our thinker may conclude) the perverse untruthfulness of an exaggerated reaction. When Hume "waked Kant from his dogmatic slumbers," Kant was, no doubt, considerably affected by the new vividness with which Hume and Berkeley had brought out the extent of the merely phenomenal in our knowledge; and though Kant was too clear-sighted to deny to the perception of geometrical truths the character of synthetic *a priori* judgments, he was, nevertheless, so far a child of his time as to refuse to ascribe an objective character to our perceptions of space—a refusal due to the pressure of an intellectual fashion which tended to paralyze confidence in the *active* perceptions of the mind, and in its power of knowing any *objective* truth.

In a similar way, the student contrasting his own sense of power in causing the movements of his own body with Hume's view that causation is *mere* succession, may find in the story of the origin of empiricism good ground for ascribing Hume's position to a one-sided temper of mind—a fashion of distrust of the mind's active powers—and for returning to the intuitive view. That the empirical temper is one-sided he concludes both from the history of its origin and from the fact that it has led its votaries, in their distrust of all professed intuitions, to positions in regard to memory and to necessary truth which were suicidal. Such untenable results throw grave doubts on the initial method to which they were due, and discredit as morbid the degree of questioning and caution as to the mind's spontaneous decisions to which empiricism leads.

Here, then, the two instances in which it is conceivable that a thinker who had failed to make the controversy yield a satisfactory issue so long as the method of self-introspection had been exclusively applied, may come to a definite result if he supplement the individualist method by the social and historical.

And surely a like method may be usefully applied on a more extended scale.

Passing the eye along the history of philosophy, and comparing his own self-analysis with that of others, often tracing the differences to ascertainable social causes, the thinker modifies and corrects the conclusions which commended themselves to him while he adopted the purely individualist standpoint. The ascertaining of the causes of the varying convictions of philosophers at least gives him an additional means of testing his own accuracy. So far as they have been due to misunderstanding, he learns to avoid such ambiguity as has been found misleading. So far as they have been due to opposite first principles, he learns what has led different minds to take up varying positions in their ultimate decisions, and what tests of truth or falsehood may be found in the causes thus

discovered. Even in the present—and apart from the marked differences of intellectual habit which history presents in different ages—a man with a scholastic education differs widely from one with a scientific education. The one from his deductive habit readily assumes first principles; the other is cautious, ever mindful of the disillusionments of experience. The process of mutual correction by tact between such minds is valuable. Far more valuable, surely, is the correction of individual idiosyncrasy to be attained by the study of the history of thought all along the line—that is, by the social and historical method.

And, it may be added, if there is to be any progress in philosophy, such a method seems to be indispensable. It will leave, indeed, a sufficient number of deadlocks—of inevitable differences—to keep up the distinction of schools of thought. But to register the lessons of experience—the primary differences, the solved problems, the explanations which have passed, the topics which still appear to offer hope of further elucidation—is surely essential to real progress. Otherwise history blindly repeats itself. We each knock our head against the wall, whose hardness in proportion to the human skull has been experienced again and again by our ancestors.

No doubt a man must ultimately apply his researches to his own mind; and the final result is that he gives his own contribution to philosophy based on them or corrected by them. Thus he returns to the individual standpoint. But his provisional position, while studying the variations between different minds, is different from the standpoint from which he analyzed his own mind, and showed, by his own analysis of it, that conclusions common to him and to others necessarily presuppose certain first principles which must therefore be admitted by all. In the latter case he regards the decision of his own mind as without appeal; in the former he is, by a reflex act, questioning the origin and working of his own mental machinery—and this by comparing it with other minds. No doubt it is still his own mind which institutes the investigation and decides as to its result; but the materials it uses are different, and are such as may make him modify his former decisions and enable him to judge of their value from a wider survey.

Of course it may be said that in the very act of writing down your own analysis, and inviting another to give his, you are comparing notes and taking up so far a social and not a purely individual standpoint, though it be limited to a comparison between two minds. And again, by the fact that the most complicated studies from the social standpoint issue in a conclusion which is individual to yourself, it may be shown that they are in the last resort only the materials for an individualistic philosophy. No doubt

the distinction may thus be made to vanish. But considering that the processes are so widely distinct in kind between regarding comparatively and from outside the variations of thought in history and in the world, and regarding from within the immediate analysis of one's own mental operations, and considering that these two ways of looking at the problems in hand are opposite for the time being, and mutually corrective, it seems useful to contrast the standpoints, while allowing that both standpoints are taken up by one individual.

And now we have to consider the fact that the social standpoint, first suggested by the differences between philosophers in first principles, is also called into request by the actual considerations as to the scope of human knowledge which have been urged by the later empiricists, who appeal to evolution. The attempt to identify the intellectual and moral faculties with association of ideas is transferred by them from the history of the individual to that of the race. The development of the faculties in the course of evolution is considered. Conscience is maintained to be an instinct, commanding in its tone, telling what makes for the life of the race. The intellectual faculties are dealt with as the gradual development, in the course of evolution, of the sensible faculties—not different from them in kind.

Then, concurrently, there is the attitude towards religious conviction, which says, in effect, "We will not attack you; we will explain you." We have the ghost theory and other similar theories to account for the origin of belief in the supernatural; and the old demarcation, so convenient for the purposes of abstract philosophical discussion between natural and revealed religion, is blurred by tracing the actual convictions of Christians on natural religion to the influence of Christianity itself, while the Christian evidences are discredited by the myth-theory of modern criticism.

And here we are unable to escape the consideration of the social and historical standpoint. The allegation is that in fact the belief in Theism and Immortality in a large number of men is due to the subtle ethical influences of a Christian society. No doubt we may reply that, allowing this to be so, these beliefs can also be justified by a true philosophy of the human mind, which leaves these special influences out of account. But, as St. Thomas Aquinas says in a famous passage, such a philosophy is not likely to be directly influential with the mass of men. Granted even that it is the justification of religious belief in the few philosophical minds, and that it has indirect influence on the less philosophical through their instrumentality, you must perforce consider the question—How far has the average man ground for believing that in surrendering himself to this influence he is acting wisely and reasonably, and in a

way which gives a presumption that he will not be misled? And here we are again driven to the social standpoint.

But, in point of fact, besides this influence of the philosophical few on the many, there *is* the influence of the atmosphere—spread by Christianity around each unit in the Christian society—of the contagiousness of the belief of his fellows, of the response which the truths of Natural Religion professed by the community find in his own moral nature.

It would surely be unsatisfactory and untrue to fact to dismiss these influences as simply misleading; to confine the philosopher's efforts to an abstract philosophy of the individual mind, which can only really satisfy the majority in consequence of their trust in those who expound it; and to exclude entirely from the sphere of rational causes both that trust itself, and the other influences which actually sustain the belief of the community.

I am not denying that there is a process, reasonable in its degree, whereby less philosophical minds do rise to the conception of God apart from external teaching; but, in point of fact, man lives in society and cannot be independent of its traditions, which he learns, and which must have their effect on his beliefs. Therefore, in order to assure the average man that his belief is well founded, it is useless to appeal exclusively to a process which cannot practically take place in him—namely, the movement of his mind in response to the visible world apart from any social influences. If social influences for or against belief have been acting on him from earliest childhood, and if inherited predispositions are likewise due to external influences exerted on his ancestors, he cannot appraise the reasonableness of his belief without in some degree estimating the value of these influences, which effectively sway his mind in one way or another.

And in view of the incompetence of the average individual to do this in a trustworthy fashion—to stand outside himself, and appraise dispositions which have become part of himself—we are led to the conception of a Society or Church in which the more spiritual and profound spirits support the weaker and guide the society. In some degree the inequality of minds is compensated by the influence of one upon another. A schoolboy can learn the law of gravitation from a Newton, and be taught to prove it by his own intellect. But he could not have discovered it. Thus the greater minds bring out the rational faculties of the smaller; and an influence in one sense social gives knowledge which is truly rational in the individual.

And this may surely be so likewise in the philosophy of religion.

If a true philosophy of the individual mind leads the philosopher to attach importance to the moral intuitions, to the sentiment of

moral approval and disapproval, to the more complex judgments and sentiments summed up in the word "conscience;" if these acts or phenomena of the mind form an important link in the chain of arguments for Theism; then those in whom the moral nature is more highly developed—the saints and moral heroes—give point and additional force to the argument. Society gives in a more unmistakable form, by the most developed instances, this ethical aspect of human nature which philosophy considers to be significant. We remember Browning's account of the momentary flashes of the spiritual nature from which the most skeptical are not free—

" Just when we are safest there's a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death,
A chorus-ending from Euripides—
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears,
As old and new at once as Nature's self
To rap and knock and enter in our soul."

It is tolerably clear that such glimpses do not necessarily differentiate themselves unmistakably from mere excursions of the imagination. Place him who experiences them in isolation, and they may carry him no further. They are glimpses of what might be—"the Great Perhaps," as Browning says—but no more. They may seem, perhaps, chiefly suggestions from the æsthetic nature rather than from the deeper moral conscience. Place him, on the other hand, in contact with those whose ethical perceptions are steady and constant, and two results follow. Firstly, his own moral perceptions, such as they are, assert themselves more distinctly; and, secondly, he comes to attach more importance to them by seeing the power of more developed instances. Tennyson expresses this in the "Ancient Sage." The dissolute skeptic says of the glimpses of moral light which come to him:

" Idle gleams may come and go,
But still the clouds remain."

The Saintly Seer replies:

" Idle gleams to thee are light to me."

And he suggests that their significance would grow in the other by a sustained course of moral action.

Without attempting to decide on the rational value of this element in the basis of Theism, it seems, at least, clear that a working philosophy of religious belief cannot leave out of account what has so much influence as a cause of belief, and what has certainly in it at least some of the rational value attaching to the argument from man's moral nature to a moral author of the universe and of humanity. To reject the study of other minds in such a case, and to confine oneself to the individual mind—whose moral faculties may be abnormally undeveloped—would be to lose sight of the full force of the argument.

But I may add—to avoid misunderstanding—that this function of what I have called the social standpoint is necessarily guided by the moral intuitions of the individual which it strengthens and confirms. It is not to a *merely* external comparison of different manifestations of religion—to an exclusively social method—that I have appealed. It is the recognition that perceptions in ourselves have their counterpart more highly developed in others, which is the guide in this appeal to evidences of Theism derived from minds other than our own. That the moral consciousness is significant we learn from our personal experience—even though that experience be due in part to the action on ourselves of greater characters than our own. The *degree* of its significance may be seen, as far as the individual is capable of seeing it, only by doing his best to use his mind as a reflector of the higher perception of others, and adding to his own direct perceptions the testimony of those who see more, whom he can reasonably trust, but whose direct knowledge he can never fully share.

In the considerations I am here suggesting I am raising questions which it would carry me far to discuss fully. But I trust I have said enough to show that the conception of gaining aid for a working philosophy of religious belief from the religious experiences of others and of the race is not unreal or purely mystical. If we have any faculties which lead us to the conception of God as the ultimate satisfaction of our rational and moral nature, we are more likely to see the full significance of these faculties by having regard to men of moral genius, than by looking solely at ourselves. The greatest truths—scientific and mathematical—are known to the individual through his appreciation of the lead which genius offers to give him. His own faculties are educated and directed by studying the mind of a Newton or a Laplace. And so it may be with religious truth. And if revelation professes to have culminated in One in whom an absolutely Divine nature has been manifested, and whose teaching is calculated to draw forth moral aspirations and perceptions of a higher order than any which mankind had previously known, such a profession would be in harmony with the hierarchy of knowledge and the means of attaining to it which we find in human society. The union of our own perception with trust in the guidance of One who sees fully and clearly what we could only discern imperfectly and by glimpses, the increased confidence in our own glimpses due to His fuller explanation of their sources and import, would be a fresh instance of an order of grace which follows more perfectly the order of nature.

WILFRID WARD.

THE SULPITIANS AT THE CRADLE OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY.

RELIGIOUS freedom had not existed in the English colonies, which after the American Revolution became the original thirteen States composing the Federal Union. The odious penal laws of England had been embodied to a great extent in the codes of all the respective colonies, except Pennsylvania.

Prior to the close of the American Revolution, in consequence of adverse laws, comparatively few Catholics outside of Pennsylvania had a free status in the colonies.

In Maryland at this epoch there were probably 10,000 Catholics.

The Fathers of the Society of Jesus, who were affiliated with the London Province, had for more than a century ministered to the spiritual needs of the Catholic colonists and of their descendants, of high and of low degree.

The same Fathers had evangelized the Indian races living on the soil.

No better description of the Catholic people of Maryland at the dawn of the American Republic may be found than that written by Dr. Carroll in 1790:

"In founding the colony of Maryland," he wrote, "the Second Lord Baltimore, desirous of encouraging the settlers to maintain the form of worship they desired, took no clergymen officially, but erected chapels for each creed, leaving the people to arrange for a minister as they chose.

"Father Andrew White and another Jesuit Father came out with the first settlers as gentlemen adventurers, under the proposals issued by Lord Baltimore, bringing out mechanics, farmers and laborers. As proprietors they took up lands, and those that followed them did the same.

"Attempts were frequently made to introduce the whole code of penal English laws, and it seemed to depend more on the temper of the courts of justice than on avowed and acknowledged principles that these laws were not generally executed, as they were sometimes partially.

"Under these discouraging circumstances Catholic families of note left their Church and carried an accession of weight and influence into the Protestant cause. The seat of government was removed from St. Mary's, where the Catholics were powerful, to Annapolis, where lay the strength of the opposite party.

"The Catholics, excluded from all lucrative employments, harassed and discouraged, became in general poor and dejected. But in spite of their discouragements their numbers increased with the increase of population.

"They either had clergymen residing in their neighborhoods or were occasionally visited by them; but these congregations were dispersed at such distances, and the clergymen were so few, that many Catholic families could not always hear Mass or receive any instruction so often as once in a month.

"Domestic instructions supplied in some degree this defect. Among the poorer sort many could not read, or if they could, were destitute of books, which, if to be had at all, must come from England; and in England the laws were excessively rigid against printing or vending Catholic books. Under all these difficulties it is surprising that there remained in Maryland even so much as there was of true religion.

"In general Catholics were regular and inoffensive in their conduct—such, I mean, as were natives of the country; but when many began to be imported as servants from Ireland, great licentiousness prevailed amongst them in the towns and neighborhoods where they were stationed, and spread a scandal injurious to true faith.

"Contiguous to the homes where the priests resided on the lands which had been secured for the clergy small chapels were built, but scarcely anywhere else. When divine service was performed at a distance from their residence, private and inconvenient houses were used for churches.

"Catholics contributed nothing for the support of religion or its ministers; the whole charge of their maintenance, of furnishing the altars, of all traveling expenses fell on the priests themselves, and no compensation was ever offered for any service performed by them, nor did they require any so long as the product of their lands was sufficient to answer their demands. But it must have been foreseen that if religion should make considerable progress, this could not always be the case."¹

When, in 1773, the Society of Jesus was suppressed throughout the Christian world by a Papal edict, Bishop Challoner, Vicar Apostolic of London, under whose control the Jesuit Fathers had been serving in Maryland, notified their Superior, Very Rev. John Lewis, of the fatal decree by a letter dated October 6, 1773. In this letter was a copy of the Latin form of submission to the decree, which was to be signed by each of the Fathers, according to instructions from Rome and returned to him for transmission to the Papal

¹ "Life and Times of Most Rev. John Carroll," etc. By John Gilmary Shea. New York, 1888. Pages 48 et seq.

Court. This would terminate the existence of the Fathers as Jesuits, leaving each, however, with his sacerdotal faculties as a Catholic priest. With these proceedings, the autonomy of the Society of Jesus, which had existed in the Anglo-American colonies for 139 years, came to an end.

All the estates and plantations, as explained by Dr. Carroll, having been held in fee simple as individual property, escaped confiscation and were thus saved for religious purposes.

The ex-Jesuit Fathers, who still recognized Father Lewis as their superior, continued their missionary labors.¹

Most Rev. John Carroll was born July 8, 1735, in Prince George's county, Maryland. His father, Daniel Carroll, an Irish gentleman, was a successful merchant. His mother, Eleanor Darnall, a lady of old Maryland stock, had received a finished education in France and was admirably endowed with the accomplishments requisite for the formation of the character of her children.

This branch of the Carroll family was related to the senior branch represented by Charles Carroll, of Carrollton. After a course of a year at the Jesuits' school at Herman's Manor, young Carroll, then in his 13th year, was sent to the celebrated Jesuit College of St. Omer, in French Flanders, where he spent six years, and even among his brilliant classmates won a high reputation. In this institution were the young Marylanders, Joseph Hatherton, William Horne, Peter Jenkins, George Knight, Joseph Emmott and Joseph Tyrer, all future Jesuits; Robert Cole and the future Church historian, Joseph Reeve. He then spent two years devoted to meditation and training for spiritual life under Father Henry Corbie. There were sixteen aspirants in the novitiate. He was then sent to the Jesuits' College at Liège for a course of philosophy and theology. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1759. In the meantime his father had died in 1750; but previous to making his final vows Father Carroll had renounced in favor of his brother, Daniel, and his sisters, Ann, Betsey, Ellen and Mary, his claim to the property of his father. Heretofore his career had been marked by assiduous study, while a long continuous retreat had preceded his ordination.

He needed rest, and gladly accepted the offer of Lord Stourton,

¹ The Jesuit Fathers engaged in missionary work, principally in Maryland and Pennsylvania, but also in the adjacent parts of New Jersey and Virginia, included Very Rev. John Lewis, vicar general under the Vicar Apostolic of London, and John Ashton, George Bolton, John Boone, Bernard Diderick, Thomas Digges, Joseph Doyne, Ferdinand Farmer, James Frambach, Lucas Geisler, John Hunter, Arnold Livers, John Lucas, Matthias Manners, Ignatius Matthews, Robert Molyneux, Peter Morris, Joseph Mosley, Benedict Neale, James Pellentz, John B. de Ritter, Louis Roels and James Walton. There were also in Europe the following Jesuit Fathers, who returned to Maryland in 1774, Sylvester Boarman, John Carroll, Augustin Jenkins and Charles Sewall. The latter four were all members of prominent Maryland families. The autonomy of the Society of Jesus in Canada had not been extinguished at the time of its suppression.

an English Catholic peer, to become the traveling companion of his son, and several years were spent in visiting notable places on the Continent. This tour was of great advantage to the future Bishop, in the experience derived by visiting notable cities, by becoming known to many distinguished people in the Church and by the perfection of his linguistical attainments, which were considerable. Upon the return of the travelers to Stourton Castle, Father Carroll received many invitations from Catholic families of note to visit their aristocratic homes. He became the guest of Lord Arundell and performed his first missionary work among the tenants of his noble host.

In the meantime it became apparent to Father Carroll that a crisis was impending in the political relations of England with her American colonies, which were upon the verge of revolt.

He considered that under such circumstances his duty required his return to America. He obtained faculties for priestly work in America from Bishop Challoner, bade adieu to his aristocratic friends, sailed for America and arrived at Richland, Va., late in June, 1774. After a brief visit to his sisters, Mrs. Robert Brent and Mrs. William Brent, he hastened to his mother's home, on Rock Creek, where, after an absence of thirty years, he was lovingly welcomed by the venerable lady and by her two daughters, Betsey and Mary. The American Revolution ensued. When the colonies had won their freedom and a Federal Union had been formed, the ex-Jesuits, who still recognized Very Rev. Father Lewis as their Superior, were by the latter assembled in council.

At this assemblage a petition to the Holy See was signed praying for the appointment of a Prefect Apostolic to govern the faithful in the American Republic and forwarded to Rome.

No candidate was proposed; but the situation in America seems to have been well understood by the Propaganda, which promulgated a decree organizing the Catholic Church in the United States and appointing Father John Carroll Prefect Apostolic. This decree was signed by Cardinal Antonelli, by direction of Pope Pius VI., June 9, 1784.

In 1785 Dr. Carroll made his first episcopal visitations to the Catholic communities in Maryland, Pennsylvania, the adjacent parts of New Jersey and Virginia, administering for the first time in the history of the Church in the United States the Sacrament of Confirmation.

In 1786 he made his permanent residence in Baltimore, and in 1789 he was elevated to the episcopacy as the first Bishop of Baltimore, with jurisdiction over all the territory comprised within the thirteen States and their dependencies—a region probably greater

in extent than was at the time confided to any prelate of the Church. This was the completion by Rome of the foundation of the American hierarchy, upon which Bishop Carroll was destined to rear the grand outlines of the American Church.

The appointment was officially promulgated at Rome by Cardinal Branchi Onesti November 6, 1789. It remained for Bishop Carroll to be consecrated. The ceremony might have been performed in Baltimore by the Bishop of Quebec; but that venerable prelate was not his own master. The Governor General of Canada held him under restraint, which, however exercised with apparent deference, was nevertheless effective. Bishop Carroll knew that Bishop Hubert would not be allowed to come to Baltimore for such a ceremony.

Among the Catholic gentlemen who had entertained Dr. Carroll in England was Thomas Weld, of Lulworth Castle, representing one of the wealthiest hereditary Catholic families of England.

Mr. Weld wrote the Bishop-elect, inviting him to Lulworth Castle, where a fine chapel recently completed would afford every convenience for the august ceremony of his consecration.

This friendly invitation, coming at a time when the Continent of Europe was in a state of unrest, was gratefully accepted.

Bishop Carroll went to England, and the solemn ceremony of consecration was performed by the venerable Bishop Charles Walmsley, senior Vicar Apostolic of England, on the feast of the Assumption, August 15, 1790, in the so-called private chapel of Mr. Weld, which was in fact the most richly appointed Catholic church in all England, whose princely founder omitted no circumstance to give eclat and dignity to so memorable a function. An ex-Jesuit and life-long friend of the Bishop, Father Charles Plowden, preached the sermon.

Bishop Carroll made the day the patronal feast of his diocese, and in time obtained from the Holy See special indulgence for its commemoration. Although receiving many attentions from his host and invitations from his noble friends to their aristocratic homes, he felt that his episcopal life had but begun, and that his extensive diocese needed his presence. Before leaving England he received with kind wishes from Mr. Weld and from others of his admirers liberal donations of money for his episcopal work in Baltimore, which greatly encouraged him.

Before the wild storm which was to result in carnage and in chaos had burst upon France, while the impending war upon religion had become but too apparent to her venerable hierarchy and to her clergy, the Rev. M. de Saint Felix, Superior of the Theological Seminary of Toulouse, wrote the Abbé Emery, Superior

General of the Order of St. Sulpice at Paris, that it would be advisable to transfer their seminary to some locality outside France, where the freedom of religion would permit the concourse of a faculty for the training of aspirants to the priesthood in accordance with the intention of the saintly founders of their order, until such time as it would be feasible to re-establish their status in France. This suggestion coincided with the views of the sagacious Sulpitian chief. But where was this temporary Seminary of St. Sulpice to be located?

Realizing the gravity of the situation, the Abbé Emery was providentially moved to consult the Papal Nuncio to the French Court, Cardinal Dugnani. This eminent ecclesiastical diplomat had met and had greatly admired Bishop Carroll while the latter was a priest, while he foresaw the future expansion of the Church in the United States under the administration of such an able man as the Bishop. He knew he was *persona grata* with the Propaganda, and he advised the Abbé Emery to correspond with him, while he was in England awaiting consecration, with a view to the establishment of a Sulpitian Seminary at Baltimore.

The Abbé wrote to Bishop Carroll, inviting him to a conference in Paris, but the Bishop did not like the situation in the French capital and declined. Father Nagot, a venerable and holy Sulpitian, was then sent to London to confer with Bishop Carroll.

He offered professors and ample means to establish a Sulpitian Seminary at Baltimore, and his offer, on behalf of the Abbé Emery, was gratefully accepted.

"We arranged all preliminaries," wrote Bishop Carroll, "and I expect at Baltimore in the summer some of the gentlemen of St. Sulpice, Paris, to begin the work, and I have reason to believe they will find the means to carry their plan into effect."¹

This was the inception of the movement which in time resulted in the advent at Baltimore of the French sacerdotal element, whose great piety and whose eminent learning made these priests a powerful auxiliary in the rearing of the infant hierarchy in the United States.

The Bishop left England early in October and arrived at Baltimore-December 7, 1790.

He was warmly welcomed and given an ovation by a multitude of his friends. On the following Sunday he was formally enthroned in his pro-Cathedral, when in fact his status as Bishop of Baltimore and of all the United States was locally established. Under his spiritual control were thirty-five priests. There were churches or chapels in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston and

¹ Shea: "Life and Times," etc.

Charleston; at St. Inigoes, Newtown, Newport, Port Tobacco, Rock Creek, Annapolis, White Marsh, Bohemia, Tuckahoe, Deer Creek, Frederick, Hagerstown and some minor stations in Maryland; at Lancaster, Connewago, Goshenhoppen, Elizabethtown, York, Reading, Carlisle and Greensburg, in Pennsylvania; Coffee Run, Delaware; at Vincennes, Kaskaskia, Cahokia, Prairie du Rocher, in the parts under the actual control of Bishop Carroll; while there were churches and priests at Detroit, River Raisin, Michilimackinac, in parts unlawfully held by England and under the spiritual control of the Bishop of Quebec; a priest and church at Natchez and elsewhere under the Bishop of Havana.

In accordance with the arrangements made in London the Abbé Emery sent the following Sulpitian Fathers, all of whom were ex-directors of Sulpitian Seminaries in France, to organize the faculty of a Theological Seminary in Baltimore: Nagot, Francis C., Superior; Levadoux, Michael; Tessier, John; Garnier, Anthony; Montdesir, Louis, and De Lavau, Louis C. These Fathers were accompanied by four seminarians. This party reached Baltimore July 10, 1791. They were welcomed by Father Sewal on behalf of Bishop Carroll, who was absent, and installed in the home which had been prepared for them.

Announcing to the Catholics of his diocese the coming of the Sulpitians, Bishop Carroll wrote: "This is a great and an auspicious event for our diocese, but it is a melancholy reflection that we owe so great a blessing to the lamentable catastrophe in France."

Father Nagot purchased a tract of four acres, on which were buildings, in the vicinity of Baltimore. A temporary chapel was arranged and suitable quarters provided for the distinguished Sulpitians. This was the origin of St. Mary's Seminary of Baltimore.

The sacerdotal exodus from France to the United States had, however, but commenced.

In 1792 there arrived the following ex-directors of Sulpitian Seminaries: David, John Baptist Mary; Flaget, Benedict Joseph. With these Fathers came Badin, Rev. Stephen Theodore, in minor orders, and Barrel, Louis, seminarian. There subsequently arrived as exiles from France: Chabrat, Guy Ignatius; Cheverus, John Lefevre; Ciquard, Francis; Cattelin, Charles James; Dilhet, John; DuBois, John; DuBourg, William Louis; Fournier, Michael J.; Janin, Louis Charles; Maréchal, Ambrose; Matignon, Francis A.; Moranvillé, John; Olivier, Donatién, and his brother John; Richard, Gabriel; Rivet, John; Romagné, Frederic P.; Salmon, Anthony, and others, all of whom, with the exception of Father Richard, had been directors or professors in Sulpitian Seminaries in France. These venerable and learned ecclesiastics were received

and domiciled by Father Nagot at St. Mary's Seminary, and all of them were cordially welcomed by Bishop Carroll.

In accordance with the expressed wishes of the Holy See, Bishop Carroll convoked the venerable clergy of his diocese in synod November 7, 1791, to adopt statutes appropriate to the position of the Church in the United States which would insure uniformity in its service and rule in the widely separated localities of the diocese,

The majority of the priests assembled were *ci-devant* Jesuits; with them were the eminent Dominican Father Fleming and the Sulpitian Fathers Nagot, Tessier and de Lavau, of St. Mary's Theological Seminary.

The convocation at that early period in the history of the American hierarchy of so many distinguished priests gave assurance to its founder that the results of the Synod would be advantageous to religion. And so they were.

Generally speaking, the statutes enacted are comprised among the rules of practice of the Catholic Church in this country at the present day. The official proceedings of the synod, sent to Rome for ratification, were accompanied by the unanimously signed petition of the Fathers assembled for the appointment of a coadjutor to the Bishop of Baltimore, who would share in his work and be his successor.

The sequel of this movement was the appointment of the Very Rev. Leonard Neale, president of the young college at Georgetown.

The migration of Catholic families from Maryland to Kentucky had been increasing during two decades to such an extent that Catholic settlements had grown up at Pottinger's Creek and at Bardstown. In 1792 Bishop Carroll made his first ordination by conferring deacon's orders on Rev. Stephen Theodore Badin and minor orders on two other students of the seminary. On May 25, 1793, he elevated Rev. Mr. Badin to the priesthood. Thus, one of the Sulpitian seminarians from France had the honor to be the first priest ordained in the United States.¹

In 1796 "Detroit and its dependencies" were evacuated by the British, who yielded possession of this post and of others which they had illegally held in Ohio, Illinois and on the island of Mackinac. Spiritual control over these centres, which had been exercised by the See of Quebec, was, during the same year, surrendered to Bishop Carroll, thereby considerably augmenting his diocesan territory. In the meantime Father Garnier, one of the first of the Sulpitians who had arrived, was commissioned by the Bishop to organize the second Catholic parish in Baltimore at Fell's Point. St. Mary's Theological Seminary at Baltimore, under Director

¹ Register of ordinations at Baltimore.

Nagot, was yet in its initial years. The eminent directors, the professors and the priests of the Sulpitian Seminaries in France, who to the number of thirty or more had followed Father Nagot as exiles, the majority of whom were not among the faculty of St. Mary's, brought Bishop Carroll to assign them missionary work wherever in his extensive diocese souls might be saved.

Such volunteers were greatly needed, for age had terminated the careers of many priests, and others had become martyrs while preparing the victims of yellow fever for death, by the contraction of the dreadful scourge. And, again, others had resisted his episcopal authority and were no longer available. The offer of service by these distinguished French priests was considered providential and gratefully accepted.

In 1792 Father Michael Levadoux was sent to Kaskaskia, in Illinois, an old missionary centre, and during the French régime a military post.

It had a population of French, of half-breeds and of Christian and Pagan Indians.

It was a mission more likely to dishearten than to console such a saintly priest and scholar as was Father Levadoux. He was made Vicar General of the Illinois mission and Father Gabriel Richard was assigned as his assistant. The last of the incumbents in the pastorate of Ste. Anne's of Detroit under Quebec was Father Frechette, who was recalled by his ordinary when Bishop Carroll succeeded to the control.

This ancient parish was the centre of a missionary system which extended from the head waters of Lake Erie to the shores of Lake Superior, taking in the islands and littorals of Lakes St. Clair, Huron, Michigan, the Georgian Bay and the River St. Mary. The chief pastorate of Detroit was confided to Father Michael Levadoux, with Fathers Gabriel Richard and John Dilhet as assistants. By this arrangement three of the eminent Sulpitian exiles were associated in spiritual work, which for its territory included all the northwest regions of the United States.

But the work was laborious and more or less unsatisfactory, if not repugnant to such a priest and scholar as was Father Levadoux.

It has occurred to us at times, when investigating the facts relating to the early history of the Church at Detroit, which now traverses a period of two centuries, that Vicar General Levadoux may have been seriously affected by nostalgia. But we would not venture to suggest that he sought his recall to Baltimore as a preliminary to his return to France, for this is a question.

It was not until April 17, 1795, that the Sovereign Pontiff issued Bulls appointing Vicar General Leonard Neale Bishop of Gortyna

and coadjutor of the Bishop of Baltimore; but owing to the disturbed condition of political affairs on the Continent, these Bulls did not reach Baltimore for a year or more.

When Napoleon became supreme ruler of France he restored religion and re-established the hierarchy and priesthood under the Concordat of 1801. The Abbé Emery, still Superior of St. Sulpice at Paris, deemed the time opportune for the reopening of seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood by his congregation. He resolved to recall all the Sulpitian Fathers in the United States to France. In 1803 Father Nagot and other Sulpitians received positive instructions from the Abbé Emery to return to Paris.

The venerable Father Superior of the Seminary of St. Mary at Baltimore, which he had founded, preferred to remain; but Father Garnier, who had organized the church at Fell's Point; Father Levadoux, who had returned from Detroit, and Father Cottelin sailed for France in May, followed in July by Father Maréchal.

It seemed probable to Bishop Carroll that a serious misfortune was impending which would deprive him of the facility for the education of priests and deplete his corps of missionaries.

He could not hope to replace the professors of St. Mary's Theological Seminary, while the exodus of his zealous Sulpitian missionaries would disorganize religion in his extensive diocese. The Abbé Emery had been disappointed and discouraged at the sparse results attained by the learned faculty of St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore during ten years, besides the expenditure of much money.

He considered its accomplishments to have been a failure. But this was owing to the unsettled state of affairs in the United States following the American Revolution, of which he had no general knowledge.

It is also probable that the venerable Sulpitian chief was unaware of the great work accomplished under the intelligent direction of Bishop Carroll by the Fathers of his Congregation who had been exiled from France during this memorable decade.

Where their efforts had been directed they had inspired Catholic communities with a greater respect for religion, while they had adorned the sacred ceremonies of the Church and of its altars to an extent hitherto unknown in the United States.

They had, moreover, sown the seed which was destined in the future to yield a rich harvest, when the growth of cities and of States, with the multiplication of Sees, the expansion and the development of the Catholic faith in cosmopolitan communities would, under the wise administration of Bishop Carroll, shape the expansion of the Catholic Church in the United States.

When Pope Pius VII. went to Paris in 1804 to place on the head of Napoleon the imperial crown of France, the Abbé Emery, to decide the question as to the seminary at Baltimore, sought the guidance of the Sovereign Pontiff. He represented to His Holiness the need he felt of members in France to re-establish the former Sulpitian Seminaries, and on the other hand the scanty fruit produced in the diocese of Baltimore, where several who had been capable directors of theological seminaries were now employed in subordinate positions. The Holy Father heard the Superior of St. Sulpice with affectionate interest, but he replied: "My son, let this seminary subsist, let it! It will bear its fruits in time! To recall the directors in order to employ them in France, in other houses, that would be stripping St. Paul to clothe St. Peter." This terse and encouraging reply put an end to all the Abbé Emery's doubts and hesitation, and from that moment the seminary at Baltimore, for which he had made so many sacrifices, acquired even a greater hold on his affections.¹

And this decision also decided the question of the recall of the Sulpitian Fathers engaged in missionary work in the United States. They remained.

Divine Providence had thus interfered in aiding the work of Bishop Carroll.

But the Catholic faith had gained a foothold in some of the cities of the Republic where Puritanism had long prevailed.

The drastic policy of England in her government of Ireland had caused the exile of many bright men, who became distinguished as merchants and as soldiers in Europe and in America. Some of these exiles who came to New England were gifted with mercantile abilities of a high degree. They found favor with the leading merchants, who winked at their religious belief, the tenacity of which had caused their expatriation, while they profited by their association in commercial affairs. From this element a Catholic community had grown up in Boston, before the creation of the Episcopal See of Baltimore, around which had clustered Catholics of other nationalities. Priests from Canada had made occasional visits during colonial times, while subsequently the chaplains of the French fleets had kindly ministered to the spiritual needs of the faithful in this, the principal city of New England. Two of the

¹ Shea: "Life and Times," etc., p. 608, who quotes from Faillon, "History of the Seminary of St. Sulpice," manuscript; and in addition remarks: "The Rev. James Andrew Emery, superior of the Congregation of St. Sulpice, was born at Gex, August 26, 1732, son of an important functionary in that place. From the Jesuit College at Macon he entered St. Sulpice and was ordained in 1756. Professor at Orleans and Lyons, superior at Angers, he became in 1782 superior general of St. Sulpice. Imprisoned for sixteen months during the Revolution, he was liberated in 1794, and though he administered the Diocese of Paris under Napoleon, he refused the mitre." In 1810 he refused to become the tool of the Emperor, who on this account closed all the Sulpitian seminaries. The Abbé Emery died April 25, 1811.

priests sent by Bishop Carroll had been unedifying in their conduct; they had given scandal and had caused the Bishop much annoyance before he was compelled to withdraw their faculties, when they departed. Father Thayer, scion of an old Boston family, who had been converted and had been ordained at Rome, who was a zealous young priest, was next appointed to the pastorate at Boston; but he did not possess the qualities requisite for pastoral work in such a field. He resigned and sought other fields for ministerial work. Father Matignon, Doctor of the Sorbonne, which title was a brevet of distinction in Catholic France, who was a priest of great piety and learning, joined to which qualities he was gifted with administrative abilities of a high order, was selected by Bishop Carroll to succeed Father Thayer at Boston; to reorganize and to give new life to the limited Catholic community in the centre of New England Puritanism. It was a providential event for the Church. The sincere piety and the intellectual gifts of Dr. Matignon disarmed the inherent prejudice existing, while his tact and bonhomie won the hearts of the people whose spiritual interests had been confided to his care. Father Ciquard, another of the Sulpicians; who had desired an Indian mission, was sent to the Passamaquoddies, in Maine, in response to their reiterated petitions for a *black gown*. Dr. Matignon and Father Ciquard soon discovered the existence of Catholic communities, among whom the faith was still bright, in many other parts of New England. To the great joy of the saintly Doctor of the Sorbonne, the future Cardinal Cheverus was sent to Boston to assist him in his work.

The amiable qualities of Father Cheverus, his bright and cheerful disposition and his sincere piety, seemed a providential light shed upon the isolated *vie intime* of the priest and scholar, Dr. Matignon.

This agreeable association continued until July, 1797, when Father Cheverus was directed to relieve Father Ciquard at Passamaquoddy, in Maine, who wished to retire. On his way to the Indian mission he visited localities where small communities of Catholics needed his services, and after a year spent in missionary work he rejoined Dr. Matignon in 1798. The yellow fever became epidemic in Boston during that year. During its ravages both priests exhibited a picture of heroic courage and devotedness that filled all men with admiration.

It was a new lesson to see Catholic priests fearlessly facing the most dreadful pestilence.

In 1799 action was taken for the erection of a Catholic Church in Boston. A subscription list was opened and \$4,000 subscribed, which included liberal amounts from Protestant gentlemen, including John Adams, President of the United States. A suitable site

was purchased on Franklin Square, on which ground was broken by the Catholics of Boston on St. Patrick's Day, 1800, for the erection of the new church, the plans for which had been donated by James Bulfinch, a Protestant gentleman. It was to be of the Ionic order and handsome.

Three years and a half later the Church of the Holy Cross was ready for dedication. It was a fine edifice, built of brick, 60 by 80 feet and had cost more than \$20,000, which had been provided by the joint labor of Fathers Matignon and Cheverus.

Bishop Carroll came from Baltimore, and on September 29, 1803, with great ceremonial, dedicated the finest Catholic Church in all New England.

After this historical event in the history of the Church in the United States the two distinguished priests continued to visit the Catholics scattered from Connecticut to Maine. In 1804 Father Cheverus succeeded in having sent to the faithful Catholic Indians in Maine his fellow-townsmen, Father Romagne, who for twenty years devoted his life to their spiritual care.¹

But there were other Catholics in Maine who were as steadfast to their faith as had been the aboriginal occupants of the soil.

Father Cheverus in a letter to Bishop Carroll dated at Newcastle, Me., July 20, 1808, wrote:

"Dr. Matignon, having authorized me in your name to bless the church newly constructed here and the cemetery adjoining it, I performed the ceremony the 17th of this month.

"The church is called St. Patrick's; the name seemed to gratify our friends here; I liked it myself because it proclaims that our church here is the work of Irish piety.

"The church is built of brick, 50 feet in length and 25 in breadth. It is on the whole a very neat and elegant little chapel.

"The cemetery is walled all around and has a neat gate. A large cross is placed in the middle. The expense will be about \$3,000, out of which I am afraid our generous friends Messrs. Kavanagh and Cottrill will be obliged to pay \$2,000. They have also given three acres of land, on part of which are the church and the cemetery. . . .

"How happy we should all have felt had we been blessed with your presence!

"'Oh that our good and venerable Bishop were here!' was the prayer of every heart, and repeated by every tongue. The whole

¹ For an authentic account of the Indian bibliographical works of Father Romagné, see the "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages," by James Constantine Pilling (Smithsonian). Pages 437-8. Washington, 1891. This author has immortalized the memory of Catholic missionaries among the Indian nations of America. A review of his works by Richard R. Elliott will be found in the current numbers of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1894-1895.

assembly, a numerous and respectable one, were hospitably entertained at Mr. Kavanagh's house. . . .

"The zeal and the unlimited generosity of the dear Mr. Kavanagh are above all praise. It is he who encouraged us to begin our church in Boston, and who was the greatest help toward finishing it. He inspires part of his zeal into the heart of his partner, Mr. Cottrill, who co-operates in every good work he originates. A letter from you would, I know, be received with joy and gratitude by these gentlemen. Permit me, therefore, to beg of you to write to them instead of answering me. Their address is 'Messrs. Kavanagh & Cottrill, Merchants, Newcastle, Maine.'

"If a priest is stationed here he will have a home with every comfort in Mr. Kavanagh's family, a horse and \$200 a year. Washing, mending and all will be done for him. You know this amiable family. A priest is perfectly at home; has a large and handsome chamber, and is sure to be waited upon with pleasure and to have at his orders whatever is in the house. For the past ten years, during which I have visited this vicinity, I have been cheered by the kindness and hospitality of this estimable family."¹

Thus wrote Father Cheverus, the distinguished scholar and future Cardinal. We have space for only a portion of his letter.

In 1808 the Holy See, in accordance with the prayer of Bishop Carroll, decided to divide the Diocese of Baltimore by creating the Sees of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Bardstown. Bishop Carroll desired to have Dr. Matignon appointed to the Diocese of Boston, but this learned and pious Sulpitian objected so vigorously to his appointment, asserting that the good accomplished in Boston was almost exclusively the work of Father Cheverus, "who fills the pulpit and is most frequently in the confessional," that Bishop Carroll sent to Rome the name of the Rev. John Lefevre Cheverus, describing him as "in the prime of life, with health to undergo any necessary exertion, universally esteemed for his unwearied zeal and his remarkable facility and eloquence in announcing the word of God, virtuous and with a charm of manner that recalled Catholics to their duties and disarmed Protestants of their prejudices." This was deservedly high testimony.

In consequence of the Napoleonic war in Europe the Bulls of the Holy See creating the Archdiocese of Baltimore and nominating Bishops for Boston, Philadelphia, Bardstown and New York did not reach Bishop Carroll until 1810. On All Saints' Day in that year Bishop Cheverus was consecrated in St. Peter's, Baltimore, with Bishops Neale and Egan assisting. This was a great event for the Catholics of Boston, while the heart of Dr. Matignon was

¹ Good and sincere Catholics of Milesian stock were these merchants, admired and esteemed by Cheverus.

filled with joy. The city of Boston, around whose history is entwined a wreath of historic incidents, important as they occurred in the rise of the American Republic, offers in the chapter which relates to the Catholic Church, from the times of Fathers Matignon and Cheverus to our own day, much that is marvelous in the progress the Church has made in the heart of Puritan New England.

One is inclined to believe that the footsteps of these pious and learned Sulpitians as they enjoyed their daily walk in old Boston Common, prepared the soil around which has since been reared more than forty churches, with all the up-to-date accessories of Catholic charity and of education, while Boston has become the titular city of a metropolitan See. Father Matignon passed to eternity December 19, 1818.

Bishop Cheverus was transferred by the Holy See to Montauban, France; created Archbishop of Bordeaux and subsequently Cardinal, and died in that city July 19, 1836.

The Sulpitian Father Benedict Joseph Flaget had been sent by Bishop Carroll to revive religion at Vincennes. After a journey remarkable in historic incident he arrived at the post December 21, 1792.

Here for three years his work was apostolic. The inhabitants numbered about 700. Their spiritual condition, as also their social and temporal status, would be difficult to describe.

Out of all the people at the post he could induce only twelve to approach the Holy Sacrament on Christmas Day. He was gradually improving the religious and social condition of the people and providing education for their children, when he was recalled by his Superior at Baltimore and transferred to Georgetown College, of which, at the time, the Sulpitian Father William Louis Du Bourg was president.

Father Flaget occupied a professor's chair at Georgetown during three years, serving at times in an administrative capacity. Father Du Bourg had in the meantime been sent by the Sulpitian Superior at Baltimore to open a Sulpitian Seminary at Havana; Father Flaget was recalled from Georgetown and sent to co-operate with Father Du Bourg. His experience, during his three years' residence in Havana, as described by his eminent biographer, Archbishop Spalding, forms in its narration an interesting romance. He was recalled to Baltimore in December, 1801. The Seminary project in Havana had been a failure.¹

To Father Stephen Theodore Badin, the first priest ordained in the United States, had been assigned the spiritual care of the second generation of Marylanders who had emigrated to Kentucky.

¹ Spalding: "Life and Times of Benedict Joseph Flaget, first Bishop of Bardstown and Louisville." Webb and Levering.

They numbered many souls comprised in scattered communities, accessible only by long journeys on horseback. Father Badin's work became a missionary campaign in the saddle.

When the metropolitan See of Baltimore was created, with suffragan Sees at Bardstown, Boston, New York and Philadelphia, Father Badin was invited to Baltimore for consultation as to the nomination of a Bishop for Bardstown.

Bishop Carroll intended the mitre for the intrepid missionary who had organized religion in Kentucky, which was now to be favored with a Bishop. But Father Badin positively declined the intended honor, while he so warmly advocated the appointment of Father Flaget that Bishop Carroll finally sent to Rome the name of Benedict Joseph Flaget to be Bishop of Bardstown, Kentucky, with positive and *pro tempore* jurisdiction over nearly all the Northwest territory of the United States.

To evade this responsibility, the amiable Sulpitian went to France; but while in Paris he was informed that the Holy See expected his submission. He had to submit. He secured volunteers for missionary work with substantial assistance and returned to Baltimore.

He was consecrated by Archbishop Carroll in St. Patrick's, Baltimore, November 4, 1810, Bishops Cheverus, of Boston, and Egan, of Philadelphia, assisting, the former prelate preaching. Events proved that Bishop Flaget's episcopal duties required even more exercise in the saddle than what had been endured by Father Badin. Besides, visitations had to be made to the distant parts of his diocese on flatboats and in open bateaux. His administration influenced the promotion of religion in Kentucky, in Indiana, in Ohio, in Michigan and in the regions west and northwest of the latter territory, to the extent that sees were created at Cincinnati, Detroit, Nashville, St. Louis and Vincennes.

Around Bardstown, the nucleus and centre, he had promoted the establishment of religious orders, both of men and of women, for charitable and educational work. The city of Louisville had in the meantime grown so rapidly in population, in wealth and in commercial prominence that it overshadowed Bardstown. It became advisable to transfer the see from the latter to the former city. With the concurrence of the Holy See, the translation was made in 1841.

During his administration Bishop Flaget had been aided by three coadjutors: Right Rev. John B. M. David, from July 4, 1817, until his resignation in May, 1833; Right Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat, from July 20, 1834, until his retirement to France on account of partial blindness in 1847, and Right Rev. John Martin Spalding, who succeeded Bishop Flaget as Bishop of Louisville, and who became Archbishop of Baltimore in 1864.

In 1835 Bishop Flaget visited Rome, where he was received most cordially by Pope Gregory XVI., and was entrusted with an important mission which required the visitation of all the sees of France and a conference with their respective bishops. This confidential service was a success, but its accomplishment required three years of continuous travel. The venerable prelate passed to eternity February 11, 1850, in the 87th year of his age, the sixty-second year of his sacerdotal life and the fortieth year of his episcopate.¹

Right Rev. John Du Bois was born in Paris in 1764. He made his collegiate course in the College of Louis le Grand, having for classmates Camille Desmoulins and Robespierre. His theological course was completed in the Seminary of St. Magloire, whence he was ordained September 22, 1787, and assigned as assistant in the parish of St. Sulpice and as chaplain to the Sisters of Charity connected with that parish.

In 1791 the life of a priest became unsafe in Paris. With kind letters from Lafayette and the active assistance of his revolutionary classmates, he was enabled to leave France and arrived an exile at Norfolk, Va., in August, 1791. He was kindly received by Bishop Carroll, who subsequently assigned him to missionary work at Richmond, Alexandria, Frederick and finally at Emmitsburg, where he took an important part in founding St. Mary's College and in aiding Mother Seton in her memorable work.

After thirty-five years devoted to the promotion of religion and theological education, he was consecrated Bishop of New York by Archbishop Maréchal in the Cathedral of Baltimore October 29, 1826. His ring and cross were the gift of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton. He was the third Bishop. The territory was large, the Catholic population comprised of small communities outside the city and in the latter aggregated 30,000 souls, with only a score of priests, some of whom were not in good standing.

The "trustee system" was at the time in full vigor, especially in New York and in the larger towns. This local evil made his life

¹ One of the ablest legal documents from the pen of a Catholic Bishop in the United States is the *mandement* by which Bishop Flaget places under interdict the chapel, the *marguilliers*, or trustees, and the parishioners of the *Cote du Nord Est*, a succursal of Ste. Anne's, of Detroit, and about eight miles distant from the mother church on the shore of the strait. This document, written in the French language, is dated at Loretto, Kentucky, February 27, 1817. It is on file in the archives of the Church of Ste. Anne in Detroit. The trustees of this little French *fabrique*, which was attended on Sundays and festivals by Father Richard or his assistant, had rebelled against their venerable pastor and had created much scandal. Both sides had been heard by Bishop Flaget at Bardstown, who had sustained his vicar and had then issued the sentence above mentioned. The document is a masterpiece, defining the code of ecclesiastical rule and the methods for promulgating the *mandement*. But the tender heart of the saintly Bishop grieved for the spiritual woes of the innocent portion of the parishioners sentenced, and in the following spring he made the journey from Bardstown to Detroit on horseback, he reconciled pastor and flock, and amid pathetic scenes he removed the interdict.

unhappy; but he fought bravely and did not spare himself in diocesan work. The Catholic communities increased so rapidly that he was nearly overcome, when relief came by the appointment of Rev. John Hughes, of Philadelphia, as coadjutor in 1837, with the right of succession. Bishop Hughes gradually succeeded to the episcopal work of the diocese, for Bishop Du Bois had become a septuagenarian. It was Bishop Hughes who killed the trustee system in the diocese.¹ Bishop Du Bois passed to eternity December 20, 1842, in his 78th year; his sacerdotal life lasted fifty-five years and his episcopate sixteen years.

One of the most distinguished of the priests exiled by the French Revolution was Rev. William Louis Du Bourg, who arrived at Baltimore in 1794. Two years later he was appointed president of Georgetown College, which office he resigned in 1799 to go to Havana to establish a seminary in that city. The project, as has been stated, failed. He returned to Baltimore in 1803 and entered St. Mary's Seminary. Archbishop Carroll, having found the religious affairs of Louisiana and the Floridas a difficult problem, decided to send Father Du Bourg to New Orleans, in the hope that a man of such great abilities and of such acknowledged piety would soon put an end to the religious scandals existing in that city; that he would restore episcopal authority and wrest the control of the Cathedral from the renegade and profligate ex-monk Sedella. Never in the history of the American Church was so heavy a cross placed upon the shoulders of a devoted priest. August 18, 1812, he was appointed Administrator Apostolic of Louisiana and the Floridas. The devoted ecclesiastic accepted the onerous charge. But he was more of a brilliant scholar than a man of courage and of nerve. The results of his advent in New Orleans greatly disappointed Archbishop Carroll, who little knew what a sink of iniquity, in a religious and in a social point of view, that city had become. Bluffed by Sedella, the Administrator retired to a suburban parish, from which he was recalled by General Jackson, who invited him to

¹ We saw when a child, in St. Patrick's Church, Rochester, N. Y., Bishop Du Bois assisted into the pulpit, whence, amid the lamentations of the large congregation present he pronounced the dread sentence of interdiction on St. Patrick's Church and on her parishioners for trustee scandals, which had involved the death from a broken heart of the young and holy priest, Father Michael McNamara. This was in 1832. During the "fifties" we reached the Astor House, New York, on a Sunday morning in August in time to dress and to enjoy one of those famous table d'hôte breakfasts given at this house in those early days. Then we went around Barclay street to St. Peter's Church to assist at High Mass. When the parochial announcements had been read, Archbishop Hughes ascended the pulpit. Well do we remember his aquiline features and sarcastic words as he announced that he had come to St. Peter's that morning to relieve the trustees of the financial control of the church for cause. It appeared, he remarked, that a large share of the debt was owing to trustees, who were well secured, while the money borrowed from women had not been secured; he would see these unprotected creditors paid first, and in time put the financial affairs of the church on a sound basis.

chant the *Te Deum* in the Cathedral, in commemoration of the American victory won over the British invaders January 8, 1815.¹

This event was a recognition of his episcopal authority, but it did not avail. Soon after he went to Rome, where he was consecrated Bishop of Louisiana September 24, 1815.

His see included all the Mississippi States from Louisiana to Missouri. While in Europe he succeeded in the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons, France; he induced Father Felix de Andries to establish the Lazarists and to open a theological seminary at New Orleans; he gathered a band of twenty-two young priests for his see, and he was the recipient of a liberal supply of funds and requisites for his diocesan work. After he had largely recruited the Ursulines at New Orleans he turned his face homeward. Among his benefactors was the King of France, who gave liberally and who placed at his disposition the frigate "Caravane" to carry him to America. He arrived at Annapolis September 4, 1817.

After he had remodeled the whole ecclesiastical system of Louisiana and its dependencies and provided the respective parishes with young, pious and zealous priests; after he had reformed the anomalous religious status of New Orleans, and had completely changed the religious aspect of his extensive diocese, he found the burden too heavy. He resigned in 1826, returned to France and died Archbishop of Besançon in 1833.

Most Rev. Ambrose Maréchal, third Archbishop of Baltimore, was born at Ingres, near Orleans, France, 1769. His family were prominent and had him educated for the legal profession; but he developed a vocation for the priesthood, and entered the Sulpitian Seminary at Orleans, joined the society, and was ordained in 1792. The Abbé Emery, to save him from revolutionary violence, hurried his departure for Baltimore before he could say his first Mass. He, with Father Gabriel Richard and others, arrived in June, 1792. Bishop Carroll sent him to assist Father Beeston at Bohemia, from whence he was sent as professor of philosophy to Georgetown College. He was recalled to France in 1803 by the Abbé Emery, and appointed professor in the Sulpitian Seminary in Orleans, where he attained a high reputation.

The controversy between Napoleon and the Abbé Emery had for its sequel the closing of the Sulpitian Seminaries in France in 1812. In accordance with the wishes of his superior, Professor Maréchal returned to Baltimore and entered the faculty of St. Mary's Seminary.

On the nomination of Bishop Carroll, Bulls were issued at Rome

¹ Gayarre: "History of Louisiana." New York, 1866. P. 508 et seq.

January 16, 1816, naming Dr. Maréchal for the See of Philadelphia, at the time vacant. But the learned doctor preferred to remain in the faculty of St. Mary's Seminary. By the advice of Bishop Cheverus, Archbishop Neale proposed his name to the Holy See as his coadjutor, with the right of succession. Bulls were issued accordingly July 4, 1817; but in the meantime the venerable Archbishop Neale had passed to eternity. His successor, Dr. Maréchal, was consecrated Archbishop of Baltimore in the Cathedral of St. Peter December 4, 1817, by Bishop Cheverus, of Boston.

The following year the Archbishop undertook the completion of the Cathedral of Baltimore, on which work had been suspended for some years. No greater proof can be adduced of the esteem in which he was held than the substantial assistance he received from the wealthy citizens of Baltimore, both Catholic and Protestant, by which the large amount of money requisite was placed at his disposal. This monumental edifice, in which we had the honor to assist at the great Catholic Congress of 1889, was not only completed, but its interior was enriched by rare works of Christian art contributed by Cardinal Fesch and other admirers of the Archbishop in France, and was solemnly dedicated May 31, 1821.

In 1821 Archbishop Maréchal visited Rome and laid before the Holy See the condition of religion in his diocese and province. He was the first Metropolitan of Baltimore who had laid his homage before the Sovereign Pontiff. There were some important questions pending with the Propaganda, not the least of which was the influence exercised by the Archbishop of Dublin, who assumed to dictate episcopal appointments in the United States.

The results had not been advantageous to the progress of religion. The preponderance of this influence at Rome can only be accounted for by the fact that the Roman Court, which, after the battle of Waterloo and the final eclipse of Napoleon, had been restored at Rome, looked upon England as the savior of the Pontificate. Dr. Troy was probably the greatest Tory in the Irish Hierarchy, and his advice had great weight with the Propaganda.¹

Bishops were consecrated by him for sees in the United States, who swore allegiance to the British Crown and who crossed the Atlantic to assume spiritual control over American communities. The situation was made clear by Archbishop Maréchal, and this adverse Irish interference soon came to an end. During his visit

¹ Some of the readers of this review of Celtic paternity, who are not familiar with the history of the "Veto," a measure designed to give England the right to veto the appointment of any Irish bishop who was persona non grata to British rule, may be enlightened by reading the foot-note to pages 57-58 of vol. v. of the "*Life and Times of Henry Grattan*," by his son, London, 1849, which gives the genesis of the history of the "Veto." The history of this Irish religious scandal, in which Dr. Troy was mixed, may be found in the text of the volume quoted.

the Archbishop was made a Domestic Prelate to His Holiness and received from him a fine gold chalice, which is preserved in the Cathedral at Baltimore. He arranged with the Propaganda a permanent rule for the tenure of Church temporalities in the United States and for the method of nominating bishops to future vacancies in the American episcopate. Both these concessions were of far-reaching importance to the Church in this country. He returned to Baltimore in 1822, and after six years of able administrative work passed to eternity January 29, 1828. His obsequies were conducted in accordance with his ecclesiastical eminence, while the chief mourner, following the hierarchy and clergy, was the venerable Charles Carroll, of Carrollton. His ashes repose in the Cathedral vault, by the side of Archbishop Carroll, of whom he was an able successor.¹

Right Rev. Simon William Gabriel Bruté de Rémur was born at Rennes, France, in 1779. His once wealthy family suffered financially by the Revolution; but his pious mother had him educated in the Sulpitian College of his native city, where his vocation for the priesthood culminated in his ordination June 10, 1808.

While filling a professor's chair in the Sulpitian Seminary at Rennes he was recruited by Bishop Flaget for his missions in Kentucky; but his eminent learning earned for him a professorship in Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg. This was the commencement of his sacerdotal career in the United States. Subsequently he became president of St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore. In 1834 the heavy cross of the newly-created episcopate of Vincennes was laid upon his shoulders. He was consecrated at St. Louis October 28, 1834, by Bishop Flaget, Bishops Rosati and Purcell assisting. The See of Vincennes had been assigned territory which could not be well looked after by the ordinary of Bardstown. It included all of Indiana and part of Illinois. Bishops Flaget and Purcell kindly accompanied Bishop Bruté to assist at his installation in the titular city of his diocese. What the three Bishops found at Vincennes was discouraging in all respects. The future Cathedral, a brick structure 115 by 60 feet, was enclosed and roofed, but unplastered, and not even whitewashed. There were no closets for vestments and sacred vessels, while there was a simple altar of wood.

Father Lalumiere was in charge, and he informed Bishop Flaget that the total income of the *fabrique* would not exceed \$300 a year. He began preparations for Christmas. His first consolation was the number of communicants at the midnight Mass and at the two Masses succeeding. Then he made the toilsome tour of his diocese. He found Catholics everywhere; but he had no priests at

¹ Shea: "History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1808-1843." P. 98.

his disposal, and priests as well as money would have to be provided. To obtain these requisites he went to Europe in 1835.

Almighty God blessed his mission. He was cheered at Rome by the reception accorded by the Holy Father. The Emperor of Austria and his court honored him and contributed liberally in money and in requisites for the altar and sanctuary. He was equally successful at Paris and at other cities in France.

He returned to his poor diocese in August, 1836, with nineteen priests, mostly Bretons, and with a good supply of money, but fortified with hope and courage. A campaign unparalleled in the history of the American Church for its hardships, but, above all, for its great results, ensued. It continued during three years, until the frail physique of Bishop Bruté succumbed. He died the death of a saint June 29, 1839.

Right Rev. John Baptist Mary David was one of the companions of Benedict Joseph Flaget, who with other Sulpitian directors and professors arrived at Baltimore from France March 26, 1792. Of the many distinguished exiles who had been forced to abandon their chairs in the Sulpitian Seminaries of France and to seek a refuge in America, Father David was probably one of the most profound scholars and able theologians. He was selected by Bishop Flaget in 1811 to organize the theological seminary for the new see of Bardstown, under the patronage of St. Thomas.

In 1817, on the nomination of Bishop Flaget, the Holy See appointed Father David Bishop of Mauricastro and coadjutor of Bardstown, which see he temporarily filled in 1832-3.

After thirty years of unremitting labor in perfecting the religious status of Kentucky, Bishop David passed to eternity July 12, 1841, in the 81st year of his age. Had the venerable prelate lived another year the golden jubilee of his arrival on American soil would have been commemorated.

Right Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat was a sub-deacon in the Sulpitian Seminary at Paris at the time Father Flaget went to that city in the hope of escaping the mitre of Bardstown. When he found this was impossible he looked around for recruits to assist in his episcopal work. Among the volunteers was young Mr. Chabrat, who accompanied Bishop Flaget when he returned to Bardstown. He was ordained to the priesthood on Christmas, 1811. Father Chabrat had the honor to be the first priest ordained in the United States west of the Alleghenies. His missionary career was as toilsome and it was, in fact, identical with that of his saintly Bishop—for he was the companion of the latter in many long and exhausting journeys in the saddle and in the more disagreeable trips on flatboats and in open bateaux. His ordinary sent his name to

Rome for appointment as coadjutor. The Holy See appointed Father Chabrat Bishop of Bolina and coadjutor of Bardstown. He was consecrated in the Cathedral by Bishop Flaget July 20, 1834.

A cataract in his eyes soon after nullified his usefulness and he retired to France. Total blindness ensued before his death.

Let us return to the Sulpitian apostle Father Nagot, founder of St. Mary's Sulpitian Seminary at Baltimore. We have seen how he had refused to respond to the order of the Abbé Emery to return to France. After twenty years devoted to the success of his heart's dearest interest on earth, he retired from active work in 1810, surrendering control to Father Tessier, and sought in retirement and prayer that tranquillity of mind he deemed essential for the close of his life. He passed to eternity April 9, 1816.

Among the early victims of climatic disease was Very Rev. John Francis Rivet, Indian missionary at Vincennes, who died in that miserable locality in 1804. The brothers Donatien and John Olivier succeeded for a time. The former remained at Vincennes, after he had accomplished much at Cahioka, Kaskaskia and Prairie du Rocher, while the younger brother, John, was selected by Bishop Du Bourg for work in Louisiana. He became Vicar General of New Orleans, and was chaplain of the convent of the Ursuline nuns in that city from 1803 to 1807. He retired, worn out by the effects of the climate.

The memory of Rev. Joseph Picot de L. Clorivière connects with the establishment of the Convent of the Visitation Nuns at Georgetown and the aid he extended during its initial years to Mother Teresa Lawler, its foundress, a little more than a century ago.

Father Clorivière was a Breton, and in youth a Chouan major general under the Royalist leader Georges Cadoudal. He renounced the sword for the cross; became a Sulpitian, came to St. Mary's, Baltimore, and was ordained in 1812. He expired suddenly, after celebrating Mass, September 29, 1826, in his 58th year.

The order of the Oblate Sisters of Providence, for the education of colored girls, was founded at Baltimore by Rev. James Hector Joubert, a Sulpitian, in 1825.

The Rev. John F. Moranillé was identified during a quarter of a century with Baltimore city as pastor of St. Patrick's Church, at Fell's Point. Worn out, he sought relief by a voyage to France, but without avail. He died in 1824.

The Very Rev. Stephen Theodore Badin, who had the honor to be the first priest ordained in the United States, as stated, was the son of wealthy parents of Orleans, France, who fostered his vocation, as also that of his younger brother, Francis Vincent Badin, who came to America and was ordained at Cincinnati by Bishop

Flaget in 1821. After the latter had reared his churches and institutions in Kentucky, on soil prepared by Father Stephen Theodore, this intrepid missionary continued his labors among the sparsely settled Catholic families in Indiana and Ohio until prelates were appointed for each of these States.

The Pottawatomi Indians, on the St. Joseph river, who for nearly a century had kept the faith, but who had had no resident "black gown," were rewarded for their fidelity by the advent of Father Badin, who became the guest of Po-ka-gon, head chief of this nation. There were tribes of the Pottawatomi nation who were still pagan, some of whom had their cantons on the littoral of Lake Michigan. Father Badin brought these pagan communities under the rule of Christian life.

But a great evil was impending which culminated in the destruction of the Christian fabric completed by this heroic missionary. The clamor of the whites for the land of the Pottawatomi reservation, which was supported by political influence, became too strong to be resisted by the United States Government, whose commissioners managed by fair means and by foul machinations to obtain the totems of a majority of the chiefs to a treaty, by which they exchanged their valuable reservations for lands west of the Mississippi, and agreed to move thereon. But the majority of the Pottawatomi people were opposed to this treaty, and they refused to leave their sylvan homes.

A regiment of United States troops was sent to the reservation, and the forced expatriation of this Catholic people, who had been cheated out of their homes, ensued, amid scenes of pathetic desolation and of cruelty, the record of which darkens the history of civilization in the United States. Po-ka-gon and some other chiefs had, however, secured patents for their holdings from the government which could not be vitiated by the commissioners, and they retained their homes.

Father Badin's heart was broken by these events. He remained for some time with the Pottawatomi chief, and lived to see the wonderful expansion of the Church in the Western States and to assist, in his 90th year, in a very interesting ceremony.¹

¹ The brothers Stephen Theodore and Francis Vincent Badin were holy priests. There was a marked difference, however, in their personal appearance. The famous missionary had, from open-air exercise, become robust, while, like the distinguished Marshal Soult, his lower limbs had become curved from continuous use of the saddle. But he did not, like the Marshal, conceal this defect by wearing very loose trousers. His younger brother, Francis Vincent, was of that ascetic type represented by Father Nagot, Father Gabriel Richard and accentuated in Bishop Bruté. Very Rev. Father Francis Vincent administered the Diocese of Detroit during the absence of Bishop Résé, 1837-1841. In the latter year the missionary visited his brother in Detroit. He ascended the pulpit of the Irish Catholic Church of the Holy Trinity one Sunday, but instead of delivering a fine sermon, he put the congregation through a course of missionary exercises. In the episcopal residence the brothers occupied

Father John Dilhet, the assistant of Very Rev. Gabriel Richard at Detroit, 1798-1805, returned to Baltimore after the fire which destroyed the old colonial city and filled a professor's chair in St. Mary's Seminary for some years. He was a profound scholar, and, like most of his colleagues, an accomplished gentleman. He retired to France; but in the enjoyment of the surroundings of the wealth of his paternal home he wrote and published a historical work of great value relating to the Church in the United States under Bishop Carroll, "*Etat de l'Eglise Catholique, ou du Diocese des Etats Unis.*" He died in France.

The Very Rev. Gabriel Richard was born in Saintes, France, in 1764, and came of illustrious Catholic stock. He succeeded Very Rev. Michael Levadoux at Detroit in 1798, having jurisdiction from the head waters of Lake Erie to the Sault de Ste. Marié at the foot of Lake Superior, and over the littorals and islands of the intermediate lakes. His history connects with American rule over the vast territory confided to his spiritual care by Bishop Carroll, and he proved his ability to an eminent degree, for he became the apostle of religion and of civilization in the West.

He set up the first printing press in the Western regions in 1809, on which he had the honor to publish the first Scriptural and literary works in English and French in the West. His æsthetic taste is in evidence by his importation from France of the first organ whose tones added to the solemnity of the Holy Sacrifice. He was the promoter of higher and of rudimentary education in Detroit, and his academies and schools were first class. His sacred character and attributes did not prevent his being incarcerated by the British during the war of 1812. But on the return of peace he found the people in a starving condition. With his personal means and credit he purchased food, which he gave to the needy without regard to race or creed, and seed-grain, which he distributed to the farmers to enable them to plant their fields.

His fellow-citizens elected him as their representative to Congress in 1823 from the Territory of Michigan. He was the first Catholic priest who sat in the United States House of Representatives. His life-sized statue in stone was the first of any priest to be placed upon a public building in this country. He organized the Indian missions on Lakes Huron and Michigan conducted by Father Francis Vincent Badin, Fathers Bellamy, De Jean and the future Bishop Frederic Résé, the efficacy of which was attested by Bishop Fenwick in 1827.

adjoining rooms. One Friday afternoon in passing the door of the missionary's room we heard terrible groans and cries. Much alarmed, we ran to his brother's room and reported the groans. "Do not be alarmed, my son! Every Friday afternoon," said he, "my brother commemorates our Saviour's agony on the cross by self-flagellation. It is the hour of his agony."

The American hierarchy sent his name to Rome as a candidate for the first mitre of Detroit; but before this honor reached him he had fallen a victim to the Asiatic cholera in September, 1832, while caring for the sick and dying of his flock. He left as his monument the fifth Church of Ste. Anne, dedicated in 1828—his life work. His name is honored in the history of Detroit.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

LIFE IN MODERN BIOLOGY.

"Scientia nihil aliud est quam veritatis imago."—*Bacon*

MANY a time since the lord of Verulam penned his declaration that "science was naught else than a reflection of truth" has the saying seemed to be contradicted. The word "science" has come to have a very different meaning for us from that which attached to it and its Latin original in Lord Bacon's time. Something of the seeming contradiction of his axiomatic definition has been due to this change of meaning of the terms, but even under the altered conditions the contradiction has proved eventually to be always only apparent. The inductive sciences, which, according to his more enthusiastic admirers at least, Bacon was so instrumental in calling into existence, have seemed to threaten at various times during their development to prove anything but an image of the truth or to be at most a very distorted one.

It has all come out right in the end, however, and it always will. "Non aliud natura aliud sapientia dicit" ("wisdom does not say one thing and nature another"). The natural sciences will never be found definitely in apposition to revealed truth. Transition periods occur, during which inchoate scientific principles clash with a too comprehensive dogmatism, and apparently with dogma itself. Il-liberal thinkers on both sides feel a sense of opposition that does not really exist. After a time a certain *ardor controversiæ*, shared more or less by both parties, cools down and truth is found more resplendent than ever, with new laurels of victory, new claims to our admiration and acceptance. The clash of opinions has not been without its effect in any of these conflicts, for a broadening influence has been exercised upon both sides. Minds that had looked too exclusively at one side of great questions, forgetting too often, though more often indeliberately than their opponents would give

them credit for, have perceived at length that there was another side of the shield, plainly to be seen by any one who would change his point of vision sufficiently to see that other side.

In no department of science more than in that of biology has it seemed over and over again that a definite schism between scientific principles and revealed truth was inevitable; yet at the present moment biology, by her frank acknowledgment of the utter impenetrableness to her of the mystery of life, is doing more than any other of the natural sciences to draw men's minds to the contemplation of the necessity for a creator, with all that this conclusion implies. There are certain minds to whom, it is said, the principle of causation does not present itself as a necessary truth, but they are surely not the minds that have been trained in the school of the physical sciences. The biological axiom, "*omne vivum ex vivo*" ("life only from preceding life") and its corollary, declaring that even the minutest portions of living substances come only from living portions like themselves, "*omnis cellula e cellula*" ("every cell from a cell") are but unhesitating declarations of the ultimate necessity for creation.

About the middle of the present century the tenor of biologic thought was very different. When chemistry began to develop it was very soon noticed that there was a striking difference between substances that were to be found in non-living things and those produced by vital activity. This led to a division of the new science into two departments. It had been noted that life always was associated with organization; that is, only where matter was differentiated into definite portions, capable of performing certain functions, did life exist. It was further noted that the products elaborated by the congeries of living substance called an organism were very different in their composition from any other compounds that were found in nature. They were complex carbon compounds, as a rule, and could not be obtained, so far at least as the cruder chemistry of those days went, except from material that had been formed by living substances. The two great departments of chemistry were very naturally called, then, organic and inorganic.

Since the so-called organic compounds had not been found apart from life, it was concluded they would not be so found. This division of chemistry was thought surely a permanent one, and while it was considered that the analysis of the complex carbon compounds to be obtained from living things would form an interesting and extensive branch of chemical science, the synthesis of such substances, i. e., the formation of any of the compounds due to vital activity by the chemical combination of their constituents, was thought to be out of the question. The building up of natural

substances out of simple elementary materials, so as to obtain compounds ordinarily obtained from living beings or their decomposition, was looked upon as impossible. This was the distinction between living and non-living matter; the one was of simple chemical composition, the other a union of materials, not because of crude physical laws or chemical affinity, but because of vital forces beyond the domain of ordinary natural laws. The conclusion thus formulated was wider than the premises; but then conclusions not seldom are. Because organic products had not been, so to speak, manufactured was no reason why they might not.

As a matter of fact, the first quarter of the present century was scarcely over when Wöhler (in 1828) announced the synthetic production of urea. This substance at that time was known only as an excretory product of the higher animals. It was doubtless one of the last compounds in the organic series that might have been expected to yield to synthetic chemistry. Immediately after this discovery the idea gained ground, among chemists especially, that all organic material might be produced in the same way, and that even vital activity itself was only a manifestation of coördinate chemical affinities and repulsions. Life, it was hoped, would be resolved into a progressive series of chemical analyses and syntheses. This conclusion was as much wider than the premises from which it was derived as the former conclusion with regard to the impossibility of forming organic substances synthetically had been; but it took years to demonstrate the fact. Hundreds of complex carbon compounds, originally considered as impossible of existence except through vital action, have been formed by synthesis since the discovery of the formation of urea. Some of the most important compounds in industrial chemistry, in the manufacture of dyes and drugs, have been obtained in that way, but life and its essential processes remain as much beyond the chemist's scope and comprehension as ever.

It was into a scientific atmosphere, charged with this idea of the identity of living forces with certain chemical and physical principles, that the modern science of biology was born. Living things had long been ranged under a single category. Plants and animals, by virtue of the fact that they lived and grew by an internal principle and reproduced their kind, had come under a rubric that separated them completely from all non-living matter; but still the realization of how closely related they were in the ultimate elements of the physical basis provided for life in them did not come until after the discovery that ordinary plants and animals were composed alike of a large number of very similar units called cells, through a mistaken notion of the importance of their outer envelope and

the idea of constantly changing contents when they were first seen. This discovery that all tissues were composed of cells came only in the late thirties of the present century. Cells had been seen in plants, at least, long before this; but their significance had not been appreciated, nor the fact that they entered into the composition of all vegetable tissues indifferently, until it was pointed out by Schleiden at Jena.

Theodore Schwann had worked under Schleiden, and afterwards continued his investigations into the composition of tissues while teaching at the University of Louvain, in Belgium. It was there that he made his discovery, or rather furnished a sure and definite scientific basis for the observation that had been made frequently before, but in a desultory and irrelevant way, that animal tissues, like the tissues of plants, were made up of cells.

The work in which he announced his discovery, "Microscopical Researches Into the Accordance in Structure and Growth of Plants and Animals,"¹ remains still a classic in biology. The new facts which it recites show how acute an observer its author was, and how absolutely he went to nature for his materials, though it was so common in his day to theorize plentifully on the scantiest basis of facts. Schwann realized that his new discovery would surely be utilized as the basis for certain materialistic conclusions. He even doubted, it is said, whether it might not in all seriousness be considered to controvert certain religious principles as to the essential distinction between man and animals, and the essential unity of man himself. To be assured that the book was not heretical in its tendencies, he submitted it to the approval of the Archbishop of Malines, and only proceeded with its publication after receiving his *Imprimatur*. Ushered into the world under auspices so thoroughly religious as these, it was scarcely to be expected that Schwann's discovery would come to be considered as heretical in its tendencies, or that the cell doctrine which he established should become a subject for suspicion on the part of the orthodox; but such proved to be the case. Even the good Schwann himself is said to have regretted before his death that he should have been, though unwittingly and unwillingly, the agent by which much that was materialistic and irreligious in modern scientific thought was given a quasi reason for being. The kindly old man lived on, teaching the science he had done so much for until the early eighties. He died just as the great reaction against materialism in biology was setting in. As a result of the inspiration of his discovery the University of Louvain publishes one of the best known of the biological journals, *La Cellule*, and its pages give ample assurance that

¹ Translated by H. Smith, Sydenham, Soc. Publications, 1847.

his spirit still lives in the institution that was the cradle of biology. It is all the more surprising, then, that he should at all have regretted his great discovery.

Nothing is more calculated to claim our sympathy than a great thinker or investigator indulging in regret at his own work because he fears its possible evil influence, the more so if it comes at a time when his work has gone forth and he can no longer recall it. If, in addition, the work done has led to truth, however imperfect and liable to abuse that truth may be, and if the discovery constitutes perhaps a new and great step forward in human knowledge, then the lament calls, indeed, for sympathy. In at least one other case in the history of biological science is there the story of this useless regret. Schwammerdam, having discovered, with the aid of the microscope, the existence of minute organic life which had been scarcely more than suspected before, hesitated to go on with his investigations. Here was a field of vision that had so far been entirely hidden from man. This could only be so, Schwammerdam argued, because such had been the will of the Creator. It seemed to him a sacrilege, then, for a mortal at this stage of the world's history to attempt to penetrate into mysteries evidently, to his mind, hidden with a great purpose, and so he abandoned his microscopic work. There are many like poor Schwammerdam, who are continually on the lookout for the limits of investigation beyond which man must not go. Fortunately, however, this frame of mind as to the continuation of investigation is not shared by the scientific world very generally, and so discoveries continue.

Schwann, though he learned to regret a little his discovery, did not abandon his work, and his pupils have helped in the revolution of thought which has come over biology of late years, and which would render Schwann's regret more futile than it was, and perhaps change it to a feeling of sincere and deserving self congratulation, had he lived on for a few years longer.

Some of the chapters in this story of the spiritual conversion of biology I shall try to tell briefly. Schwann's discovery of cells in animal tissues seemed to possess great significance in the eyes of the biologists, who, however, were called natural scientists in his day. It had just been proven by Wöhler's synthesis of urea that so-called organic products might be produced by other means than life. Now came the further discovery that apparently seemed to reduce living tissues to the level of other physical structures. For cells had often been seen before Schwann's time, and it was thought that they originated in solutions, somewhat as crystals do. It was then that the comparison of the growth of crystals with that of

plants had a very special force as an argument, since it was thought proven that the ultimate elements of each had a like origin, from a saturated solution, as it were. Even Schwann thought it not impossible that cells might originate in solutions, and when he saw the cells of ferments in fermenting liquids, as he was one of the first to do, he even spoke of them as occurring there as crystals do, and this in spite of the fact that he seems to have anticipated Pasteur in considering fermentation as dependent on the presence of these little bodies.

The physical basis of life, the tissues, were thus seemingly demonstrated to originate according to physical laws, or at least in a manner more than analogous to physical structures of other kinds. The substances that living tissues produced by their activity had not long before been proven not to be absolutely limited for their origin to vital metabolism, but to follow ordinary chemical laws, so that the mystery of life seemed on the point of being solved. It was hoped that it would prove nothing more than a special manifestation of the ordinary scientific laws that affect matter. There was much to confirm this view. For it was well known that chemical and physical laws did have a place, and an important one, in the processes of nutrition. Moreover, it was thought, and thought authoritatively at that time and for long years afterwards, that many important nutritive processes were merely phenomena of simple chemical and physical laws. Respiration, for instance, was an expression of the law of the diffusion of gases. There existed on one side of a porous membrane in the lungs a fluid much poorer in oxygen than the air we breathe, and much richer in carbon dioxide. An interchange of gases was inevitable, according to the laws of gaseous diffusion. To secure an equilibrium of gaseous pressure there was consequently an effusion of carbon dioxide from the blood, and an infusion into it of a certain amount of oxygen from the respired air. Absorption from the digestive tract was considered to be an example of the law of osmosis. When two liquids, one containing more of some crystallizable substance in solution than the other, are placed on opposite sides of an animal membrane (a piece of sheep's bladder, for instance) a current of interchange of the substances in solution is set up through the membrane, until an equilibrium is established, when both liquids have the same amount of each material in solution. As late as the middle of the sixties Huxley was teaching in his physiology this simple explanation of digestive absorption. Other vital processes were looked at in the same materialistic way. Excretion was set down as a process of filtration; secretion was considered partly as exosmosis, and partly as the result of certain special chemical reactions.

The nascent science of biology was plunged into a vortex of materialism, from which it seemed almost hopeless to look for its rescue. As time went on the situation grew worse rather than better for a good while. Embryology showed that all living things came from a single cell. Even the most complicated beings of the highest types, up to and including man himself, developed from a single cell. While, of course, for the higher beings it was clear that the wonderfully complicated single cell that contained them *in potentia*, and in some wonderful way developed into the complex being of mature type, could not arise spontaneously, but must always come from some being already existent that resembled the organism to be, this was not so certain for organisms lower in the scale of being. Spontaneous generation had not yet been demonstrated by Pasteur to be a figment, and the idea of it due only to erroneous scientific observation.

In the midst of all this came Darwin's startling theory of evolution, that all beings were derived from some simple primordial germ, and had developed one from another along various lines to their present conditions. With the origin of cells in doubt, i. e., practically with the admission that they might originate by a sort of *nisus generativus* in an almost indifferent fluid, and with the forces of evolution to complete its development to higher things, life certainly seemed to count for very little as a force beyond the domain of matter. It was no wonder that for many years the good Schwann should regret his discovery and the impetus to biological development that it gave.

But before things had quite reached the pass that I have described the tide began to turn. First came Virchow's great work in cellular pathology. It is a most curious fact that where physiology, the science of function, has failed to bring us to a proper knowledge of various vital functions, pathology, the science of disease, has more than once come to the rescue and accomplished the purpose for us. Disease is, after all, not the independent entity it was so long considered, and is still considered in the popular mind to be, but is some perversion or inhibition of normal natural function. The presence of disease and consequent interference with function often simplifies a complex physiological problem by suppressing some of the factors that enter into it, and thus making it possible to study the remainder under better conditions; or the disappearance of some function is found to be connected after the death of the organism with some special organ or portion of an organ whose physiological role may have been unsuspected before.

Virchow's ground-breaking work in pathology soon showed that every disease of the organism was connected with some change in

the cells that composed the tissues and organs of the body. The cellular pathology proved the groundwork of pathology as we know it, and revolutionized the science. Before Virchow's time pathology was humoral; in other words, all changes in the organism were thought to be due to changes in the humors of the body, that is, in some one of its fluids—the blood, the lymph, the cerebra spinal fluid, the bile, etc. It was the antique pathology of Galen and his master, Hippocrates; but it persisted, and even the great Rokitsansky at Vienna, who did so much for pathology in so many ways and whose unsurpassed record of nearly 100,000 autopsies was not made without many important discoveries, clung to it in his explanation of disease. Virchow's work did more, however, than re-found pathology; it absolutely confirmed the cell theory and substantiated Schwann's great discovery by making it clear that on cells functional activity depends, because when cells become altered function is modified, and when they degenerate or become notably affected by a pathological process, function ceases.

One step farther Virchow went, and that was an important one for biology. It was the first step backward from utter materialism. He showed that no cell ever originated except from a preceding cell. His characteristic expression, adopted, I believe, from his great teacher, Johannes Müller, the man who influenced so many of the celebrated medical investigators of the generation immediately succeeding him, was "*omnis cellula e cellula*"—every cell derives its existence from a preceding cell. Certain pathological processes, it had been thought, fully demonstrated the fact that cells might originate *de novo* as it were, in the midst of a pathological exudate; that they might be formed, in a word, somewhat as crystals are. Just as the solution in the case of crystals was spoken of figuratively as a mother liquor, so in the case of the cells, but in a higher and more formal sense, the pathological fluid from which they were supposed to take their origin was called a mother liquor.

In certain pathological processes, after an injury, for instance, or at the beginning of an inflammation due to any cause, the first thing that happens is a swelling of the part affected, and then the development of some redness, some increased heat and some pain, evidently due to tension because of increased pressure upon the sensitive nerves in the part. These are Galen's four classical symptoms of inflammation: *tumor, calor, rubor et dolor*—swelling, heat, redness and pain. Careful examination showed that at first there was an increase in the fluids of the injured part. This was due first to the fact that because of the injury more blood was sent to the part; secondly, less blood was allowed to go away from it, because

the venous circulation was disturbed; thirdly, the lymph passages were closed by the injury and their mechanism for carrying their contents away from the site of the inflammation was interfered with; and fourthly, there was an escape of the serous elements of the blood through the injured blood vessel walls, which further added to the increase of fluids in the part.

This was the picture at the beginning of the inflammation. As the injury healed or the inflammatory process resolved itself, the picture was very considerably changed. Microscopic examination showed the presence of a number of cells that were not in the part before. Very naturally these cells were supposed to have originated in the increased fluids more or less stagnant in the part because of the pathological process at work. Virchow showed, however, that the cells all came from other cells. Certain white cells that exist normally in the blood are allowed by a provision of nature to escape through the blood vessel walls at the site of the inflammation in order to help in the process of repair, if possible; if not, to be thrown off as pus cells. Another and more important source indicated by Virchow of the new cells found in a part suffering from inflammation was the division of certain low grade cells in the neighborhood of the pathological process. These cells, the so-called connective tissue cells, were of the lowest type in the organism, but like all living matter not highly differentiated, they were for that reason the more capable of resisting destruction and of helping in the repair of tissues. Virchow demonstrated the fact beyond doubt that the cells in areas of inflammation never originated except from other cells already in existence there. No liquid, physiological or pathological, however powerful its *nisus generativus* might be presumed to be, could give rise to a single living cell. The so-called mother liquor of cells proved to be itself a cell, or a collection of cells, with indistinct outlines.

Living matter, in the higher organisms at least, had been completely vindicated. Any presumed similarity between the origin of cells and that of crystals was thus proven to be an illusion. There remained the further step for biology to take—to prove—namely, that life even in its lowest form, as it existed in the unicellular organisms, could never originate except from preceding life. The maxim, *omne vivum ex vivo*, "every living thing arises from some other living thing," had had a most varied career during the century or two before. Now it was accepted, again rejected, because some new observations seemed to show the possibility of life originating of itself.

A few years after Virchow's work saw the light came Pasteur's never-to-be-forgotten demonstrations that life never originates

where life was not preëxistent; that spontaneous generation was a scientific dream and utterly without foundation in fact. The controversy had some interesting points which it seems worth while to recall. Pasteur had challenged the upholders of spontaneous generation to a public trial before the French Academy of Sciences at Paris. He summoned them to perform in public the experiments they claimed to have made in private, and to demonstrate the results upon which they based their right to uphold the theory that abiogenesis, i. e., spontaneous generation, was not impossible. The challenged parties asked for delay, which was granted, and then for still further delay. Finally they were accounted as having lost their cause by default, and the French Academy so ruled. They seemed to have been overawed by the widely extended reputation of Pasteur as a master of exact experimentation; for, as a matter of fact, the experiments they described actually gave the results they claimed. Had they plucked up the confidence necessary to put in an appearance and go on with their work, the decision must in the existent state of the knowledge of microbiology have inevitably gone in their favor. For the preliminary condition in the proposed contest was that any infusion in which life was to appear later must be thoroughly deprived of all life by being raised to the boiling point; must be sterilized, as we say now. But it is well known at the present time that there are solutions in which all micro-organisms are not killed by simple boiling, and the infusion which Pasteur's opponents were to have used is just one of these solutions in which the temperature of boiling water is apt not to kill all the germs of life that may be present. Some of them exist in the spore stage, which is a sort of seed form that certain species of microbes assume when made to live under unfavorable conditions and which is extremely resistant to heat and cold.

Of course, had the experiments been made and Pasteur been discomfited on this occasion, it would have been but for a time, for his indefatigable industry, his wonderful intuition for the discovery of the weak point of a seemingly insoluble problem and his marvelous ingenuity in the invention of experimental methods would infallibly have led him to a demonstration of the fallacy of his opponents' position. The incident is, however, a striking exemplification of the fact that an admitted fact in the inductive sciences, accepted enthusiastically perhaps as such at a given moment, is, after all, often a very relative affair. Future discoveries may utterly rob it of the significance attached to it, even though it may not contradict the scientific conclusions it is connected with. The story is a warning, too, that the inductive sciences do not adapt themselves to polemical methods, and that demonstration and counter demon-

stration, especially in public, are apt to flatter the vanity of investigators perhaps, but not to serve the cause of truth.

Later on Tyndall, who had taken up the matter of spontaneous generation originally with the idea of obtaining substantiation for materialistic views, showed conclusively by a beautifully ingenious set of experiments that when all life had been definitely destroyed in a liquid, then life did not develop again unless introduced from without. In order to prove this he had recourse to discontinuous sterilization, as it is called; that is, he heated his liquids on several, usually three or four successive days, to the boiling point. By this means even the spores are killed. For during the intervals between the successive boilings of the liquid the spores are tempted to develop and become mature organisms, and these are easily killed by the next boiling. By this means all life is definitely removed, and after this the most highly putrescible liquids may be kept for indefinite periods of time and no change will be found in them. This absolutely settled the question of spontaneous generation, for the time at least. All honor to Tyndall, who, having taken up the subject with vastly different expectations, reached conclusions that must have been very little to his liking; yet, true man of science that he was, he hastened to make his conclusions known and settled the latest stage of a great controversy.

It might seem that there would be after these demonstrations of Pasteur and Tyndall an end forever of the possibility of holding to spontaneous generation, or, as it is being called very commonly now, abiogenesis, i. e., birth without preceding life. But it is not at all improbable that the controversy under a new aspect will be renewed early in the century to come. The spectre of spontaneous generation has been laid, and it was thought effectually, at least twice before. Redi more than two centuries ago demonstrated that maggots and worms and parasites generally, instead of arising somehow from their hosts, as had been the popular belief, a belief that was shared by most of the intelligent, too, were always the product of eggs that had either been deposited by passing insects, or had somehow gained an entrance into their host from without. A century later Spallanzani fought out again the question of spontaneous generation, minuter organisms than worms being the main subject matter of the dispute. Curiously enough, his great opponent in the controversy, who upheld the possibility of spontaneous generation, was an Irish priest by name Needham. Neither the clergyman nor his friends or superiors seem to have thought that his position, if sustained, would be a standpoint for materialism.

In very recent years microbiologists have been getting beyond the range of the microscope in their researches. There is at least

one disease whose microbic cause, though isolated and its characteristics studied, has never been seen by the human eye, even with the aid of the most powerful lenses. The individual microbes are so small that they pass through a Chamberland-Pasteur filter with ease and filtered cultures produce the disease. This is the microbe of foot and mouth disease, an affection of animals which, however, sometimes attacks man. At least two other diseases are being investigated successfully by bacteriologists, the bacterial cause of which is practically as minute as that of foot and mouth disease. In one case, with the most powerful microscopic lenses, small points of light, showing that there are highly refractive bodies in the field of vision, are all that can be seen. A slight cloudiness that comes over liquid culture media when the microbe is grown in it for several days shows that something is being produced in the liquid to disturb its transparency.

Besides these extremely minute organisms there is a class of substances coming into great prominence just now that may precipitate once more the spontaneous generation controversy. These are the so-called diastases or diastasic ferments. There exists in the stomach of all animals a substance known as pepsin, that somehow by its presence, when hydrochloric acid is also present, causes changes entirely incommensurate with its chemical or physical properties or the amount of it at work. It requires but very little pepsin, compared to the amount of food ingested, to bring about the changes that constitute digestion. The pepsin, as well as the other digestive ferments, ptyalin from the saliva, amylopsin and tripsin from the pancreatic fluid, produce effects that are not unlike those of living substances. It would almost seem as if there was a multiplication of the original small quantity of these materials during the course of digestion. These diastasic ferments resemble living things, too, inasmuch as they are destroyed by anything like high temperatures and do not regain their diastasic power afterwards. Their activity is inhibited by cold, though it may be regained later when the temperature is raised again, in this resembling minute organic life very closely.

Now recent investigations have shown that diastases play a much more important role in nature than was thought. When the seed sprouts and begins to grow, for instance, it draws its nourishment at first from certain substances that have been stored up with it. Now these substances are mainly amylaceous or starchy in character and they are prepared for the seed's nutrition by diastases that are stored up in the seed with them. Most of the bacteria produce their effects in the body by the production of diastase-like substances which they elaborate and which are absorbed into the system.

It has been shown recently that fermentation, the process which aroused the first controversy over spontaneous generation, may be produced without the actual presence of the cells of the ferments themselves. If the cells of a ferment (one of the yeasts) be submitted to pressure at ordinary temperatures the liquid that exudes has the property of producing fermentation, though it does not contain ferment cells. Careful filtration has been practised in order to assure the absence of any ferment cells; yet fermentation is set up and proceeds quite as if the whole ferment was present. This fermentation without cells has attracted a great deal of attention. The liquid expressed from the ferment cells is of the nature of a diastase, and it is for this reason that it produces the effects noted.

Now, here in this realm of vital manifestations in particles far beyond the range of the microscope, it seems not improbable that there will come perhaps another battle royal over abiogenesis. The temper of scientists at the present time seems to indicate an anticipation of this, for practically all insist on making it clear that while, so far as we know at present, there is no such thing as spontaneous generation, we know nothing definite enough in the matter to enable us to assert that spontaneous generation is impossible or may not at some future time be proven to have occurred.

Should any such question arise, however, it will be treated very much more reverentially than it was before. For life has become for the great body of modern scientific men, especially for modern biologists, a thing apart. It is acknowledged now as the great mystery wherever it has to be studied in the natural sciences, and its mysteriousness instead of lessening with time and study has deepened still more. Whatever scientific discoveries of the future may seem to point out in the matter of the origin of life, it would seem that the assurance of life itself and its processes as things above and beyond the natural sciences has now become in a way so axiomatic for scientists that no basis for materialism on this score will ever again be considered.

For vitalism, the acknowledgment of the existence of a vital principle and of vital activities apart from matter, has become quite the order of the day in scientific circles. Physiology, one of the most important branches of biology, has been especially forward of late years to express her obligations to vital force and to acknowledge that the physico-chemical explanations so long accepted for many of the phenomena of organic function, do not in reality explain, but are either incomplete or only substitute other words equally unmeaning for what is incomprehensible in the vital processes. Respiration, for instance, that looked so simple when the explana-

tion of it on the principle of the diffusion of gases seemed applicable to it, proves on more careful study to be anything but an example of that law. It has been pointed out, for instance, that deep sea fishes accomplish respiration in the depths of the sea, though the oxygen absorbed from the sea at the gill slits must be driven onward into the cavity of the swimming bladder against the enormous pressure of more than 1,500 pounds to the square inch. As Haldane, the lecturer on physiology at the University of Oxford, England, said recently (Article *Vitalism, Nineteenth Century* for September, 1898): "To put the matter in concise though perhaps figurative language, the oxygen does not primarily lay hold of, but is itself laid hold of, to be disposed of according to the needs of the organism." Respiration, external as well as internal, i. e., the interchange of gases between the blood and the outside atmosphere in the lungs and between the blood and the tissues throughout the body, is not an example of mere gaseous diffusion, but is the result of cellular activity.

As to digestion, I have already more than hinted at the great biological problem that is connected with the preparation of the food for absorption. The diastasic ferments from the salivary glands, from the stomach itself and from the intestines, as well as those from the liver and pancreas, perform functions that are very distinct from physical or chemical phenomena. The question as to whether their active principle is not actually living matter in a state of rapid multiplication remains to many minds, it would seem, an open one. Cellular energy is, of course, its admitted basis.

Absorption is not endosmosis, nor is excretion or secretion exosmosis or filtration. The highest activity of cellular life is manifested in these processes, and they can only be accomplished by this force. Long ago that grand old man of science of the middle of the century, Johannes Müller, whose work was then and has been since a source of constant inspiration to biologists, pointed out that secretion was really a process not unlike growth, the substances that were elaborated not being stored up in the gland itself, as in the ordinary processes of growth, but being exuded for the benefit of the organism as a whole. There came a time not long after his death when the process was thought much simpler and entirely amenable to chemical and physical laws. Huxley and his school represented this chemico-physical tendency in physiology, but it is a thing of the past.

How much a thing of the past it is and how different is the present feeling with regard to bodily functions and their absolute dependence upon vital activity may be gathered from the following

extracts from the works of the most prominent physiologists and teachers of the day.¹

They by no means constitute all that might have been obtained if desired, and they represent very fairly, I think, the present trend of thought in physiology the world over.

Dr. G. N. Stewart's *Manual of Physiology* is one of the best known of the recent text-books. It has for its motto the well-remembered words of the illustrious John Hunter: "Life is a power superadded to matter; organization arises from and depends on life and is the condition of vital action; but life can never arise out of or depend on organization." Dr. Stewart himself begins the book with these words: "Living matter, whether it is studied in plants or in animals, has certain peculiarities of action or function which mark it off from the unorganized material of the dead world around it."

Other writers and teachers have been just as explicit in their declarations on this subject, as the following quotations will show:

"The chemical operations performed by the living cell cannot be imitated in the laboratory or explained by any known chemical laws,"—Haliburton, *Handbook of Chemical Physiology and Pathology*.

"If, on the one hand, protoplasm is the basis of life, on the other, life is the basis of protoplasm."—Professor Burdon Sanderson, Professor of Physiology at the University of Oxford, recently knighted by Queen Victoria.

"In his doctorate thesis Johannes Miller took for his subject '*Psychologus nemo nisi physiologus*.' The time will come when the reverse, *Physiologus nemo nisi psychologus*, will need no defender. . . . The deeper, wider, more profoundly we seek to penetrate into life processes, by just so much do we perceive that what we once thought to understand by physical and chemical laws is of a much more recondite nature, and especially that it mocks every

¹ Most of these extracts I owe to my friend, Dr. George M. Gould, the able editor of *The Philadelphia Medical Journal*. He was kind enough to furnish them to me in manuscript before their appearance in the Bulletin of the American Academy of Medicine. They are taken from an article, entitled *The Passing of Materialism*, read by Dr. Gould before the meeting of the American Academy of Medicine at its last session at Columbus in June of this year. It has been the custom at least to hint that medical men have open or at best ill concealed tendencies to materialism. Dr. Gould may be taken as thoroughly representative of what is best among the thinkers of the profession in this country, so that, especially as they are very kindred to the subject in hand, I allow myself two quotations from his article. They will serve to show that at the present moment at least materialistic tendencies are not the badge of the advanced medical man:

"Even the blindest prejudice is learning that there is an unbridged chasm between the nature of intimate biologic processes and any mechanic or chemic processes, and although the dogmatic belief may not be given up, that the former will finally be explained by the latter, it is recognized that even the belief itself is (for the present at least) disloyalty to true science which dares have no prejudices."

"Materialism is therefore officially declared unscientific. If young men imagine they are scientific when they indulge themselves in the dogmatisms of materialism, they have to learn the true fundamentals both of object and method of scientific research."

mechanical explanation.”—Bunge, *Lehrbuch der Physiologischen und Pathologischen Chemie*.¹

“The fundamental conceptions of biology are, and from the nature of the phenomena dealt with must be, entirely different from those of physics and chemistry. To any physiologist who candidly reviews the progress of the last fifty years it must be perfectly evident that so far from having advanced towards a physico-chemical explanation of life, we are in appearance very much farther away from one than we were fifty years ago. Attempts to analyze life into a mere series of physical and chemical processes are based on a mistaken theory.”—John Haldane, Lecturer on Physiology at the University of Oxford.

“The influence of animal or vegetable life on matter is infinitely beyond the range of any scientific inquiry hitherto entered upon. Its power of directing the motions of moving particles is infinitely different from any possible result of the fortuitous concourse of atoms.”—Lord Kelvin, the greatest of living Physicists.

“There is more in life than the processes it controls.”—Sir William Gowers, M. D., Lecturer on Nervous Diseases, London, and the best known of English specialists on the subject.

“The living cell and not the amount of oxygen in the blood regulates the consumption of oxygen.”—Pflüger, Professor of Physiology at the University of Bonn, Germany, very widely known for his original work in physiology and kindred sciences and for his magazine, *Archives of Physiology*, which has been known for many years as Pflüger’s archives.

“We are now nearly everywhere compelled to assume a specific yet absolutely unknown activity of the living cell. We know very little about the secretion, absorption and motility of the stomach. The study of the organ has been undertaken with too many physical propositions, whereas here, as in the remainder of the digestive tract, biological laws are much more important.”—Professor Ewald, *Diseases of the Stomach*.¹

Many years ago Professor Michael Foster, the widely-known professor of physiology at the University of Cambridge, whose textbook of physiology has been the standard work on the subject in all English-speaking countries for years, and who was knighted by Queen Victoria on her last birthday, said in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: “Mechanical arrangements play but little part in the work of organs; the results of their activity can in no way be explained on simple mechanical principles.”

Professor Kassowitz, of Vienna, in his *Allgemeine Biologie*, pub-

¹ Professor Bunge, from whose well-known “Text Book of Physiological and Pathological Chemistry” the above quotations are made, is one of the most distinguished professors of his subject in Germany.

lished within the year, says: "We are learning to realize more and more the truth of DuBois Reymond's famous generalization; muscular contraction, glandular secretion, animal electric shocks, insect and animal lighting powers, ciliary movement and the growth and chemism of plant cells, all these are hopelessly obscure and mysterious processes."

The greatest of living English biologists, Alfred Russel Wallace, the discoverer simultaneously with Darwin of the theory of evolution, has always insisted, in opposition to the school of Huxley and Spencer, that the origin of life postulates a spiritual influx, and he has taken occasion of late years to express more and more forcibly his opinion in this matter.

In a word, all that is best in biological science has come to range itself against materialism as far as regards the significance of life. The present position is all the more secure, because it has been reached only after the vicissitudes of repeated discussion in which the great questions of the ultimate meaning of life, its mysterious force, its primal origin and its incomprehensible activities, have apparently been threatened with submersion beneath the waves of a too forward and dogmatic scientific advance.

The discussions have also not been without their practical as well as their theoretic value, though they have not been without certain unpleasant features, and so we may think of them as *felices culpa*. For, while it might be thought that scientific controversies over a subject seemingly so abstract and distant from practical things as the origin and significance of life, would not prove of any great service to mankind, they have proved the source of great benefits. The controversies called attention especially to minute life, to its morphology and special biology, to methods of limiting it, to its effects when unlimited. All this has been of the very greatest practical value to medicine. Pasteur's work on spontaneous generation and the subjects that very naturally followed it inspired Lister with the ideas that have revolutionized modern surgery. From the same source Koch received much of the inspiration that made him the great pioneer in modern bacteriological methods. The whole future of therapeutics is filled with ideas that owe their origin to studies in microbiology, while the subjects of the preservation of foods and of the prevention of disease have taken on, as a result of the same influence, a new and thoroughly scientific aspect in place of the unsatisfactory empiricism that characterized them heretofore.

What's the use of it? is asked a little impatiently of the scientist when science devotes her energies to the investigation of some problem of only scientific interest that would seem to have no practical

object in view. When the solution of the problem at issue seems unlikely the question appears all the more rational. As a matter of fact, however, devotion to science always brings its own mead even of practical benefit. It might seem to the casual observer that these biological controversies on the origin of life have been so much lost time, since biologists have gotten back to just the old orthodox view with regard to life that has been held for centuries by practically every one. Life is a mystery; its beginning, primary as well as secondary, is a mystery. It is beyond physical laws in its operations; it is supranatural in its origin.

But all along the line of investigation that has finally terminated in this old conclusion new discoveries have been made and important practical points worked out. Providence, surely one must say, has known how to bring good out of what looked evil in its tendencies. To the timorous Christians who fear the encroachments of science upon the spiritual order it must prove a source of heartfelt consolation; but why there should be Christians timorous in this matter seems a question almost unanswerable. Surely, *Nun quam aliud natura aliud sapientia dicit: nec dicet.*

As to the future of biology and its relations to these fundamental life questions, it seems worth the while to quote the conclusion of Mr. Haldane's article in the *Nineteenth Century* already referred to: "It is perhaps rash to speculate as to the future of any branch of science; but according to all present appearances the time is not very far off when it will be generally acknowledged that the biological are separated from the physical sciences, not through the existence of any spatial line of demarcation between what is living and what is not living, but by the fact that the fundamental conceptions of biology are, and from the nature of the phenomena dealt with must be, entirely different from those of physics and chemistry."

JAMES J. WALSH, M. D., Ph. D.

New York City.

THE LAST TEN YEARS OF THE TEMPORAL POWER. FROM MENTANA TO THE PORTA PIA.

1. Joseph Powell. *Two Years in the Pontifical Zouaves*. London, 1871.
2. *Der Italienische Raubzug wider Rom im September, 1870*. Von einem Augenzeugen. Münster, 1871.
3. Le Comte de Beaufort. *Histoire de l'Invasion des États Pontificaux et du Siège de Rome par l'Armée Italienne en Septembre, 1870*. Paris, 1874.
4. Henri d'Ideville. *Les Piémontais à Rome*. Paris, 1874.
5. G. Busetto. *Notizie del Generale Nino Bixio*. Fano, 1876.
6. Prince Joseph Charles Paul Napoléon. *Les Alliances de l'Empire en 1869 et 1870*. Paris, 1878.
7. E. Tavallini. *La Vita e i Tempi di Giovanni Lanza*. Torino, 1887.
8. R. Cadorna. *La Liberazione di Roma dell'anno 1870, ed il Plebiscito*. Torino, 1889.
9. *Politica Segreta Italiana (1861-1870)*. Torino, 1891.

THE invasion of the Papal territory and the campaign of October, 1867, which were ended by the defeat of Garibaldi and his volunteers at Mentana, were followed by a short period of tranquillity, during which the enemies of the Holy See, though checked for the time and held at a distance by the presence of the French troops, still continued to intrigue and conspire to bring about the downfall of the Temporal Power. Among the most active of these was Giuseppe Mazzini. The indefatigable conspirator who, since 1833, had organized so many piratical expeditions against the States of the various sovereigns of Italy, had taken no part in that which had just been repulsed; but, shortly before the beginning of the incursion, he had come to Lugano on the Swiss frontier to be ready, in case Garibaldi succeeded in entering Rome, to follow him thither and proclaim a Republic. Disappointed in his hopes, and more irritated than ever against Victor Emmanuel, who had withdrawn his troops on the arrival of the French, he issued a violent address to the Italians, calling on them to rise and overthrow the monarchy which had betrayed them, and then to march to Rome and plant their standard on the Capitol. But his manifesto produced no effect; the advanced party was thoroughly disheartened by its many defeats in the recent campaign, and Garibaldi, the only leader who had still influence enough to induce the people to take up arms again, had been arrested and imprisoned by the Italian Government after his flight from Mentana.

As help had, therefore, to be sought elsewhere for the realization of that unity of Italy for which he had so long worked and plotted, Mazzini, who had already discussed the matter with a Prussian officer at Florence, wrote to Count Bismarck on November 17,

1867, to suggest the formation of an alliance between the Prussian Government and the Italian Republican party. By means of his secret agents, who were often better informed with regard to coming events than the members of the diplomatic body, he had learned that Napoleon III. had even then resolved to declare war against Prussia; that about March 19, 1867, he had asked Italy to form an alliance for that purpose, and that Victor Emmanuel had consented and would furnish a contingent of 60,000 men. Mazzini therefore asked the Prussian Government to give the party of action a million of francs and 2,000 needle-guns, and he promised, in return, to destroy every possibility of that alliance by bringing on a war between France and Italy, or even, if necessary, by overturning the Italian Government and replacing it by one which would be friendly to Germany. Count Bismarck, who did not care to enter into correspondence with the head of the revolutionary party in Europe, gave no direct reply to these overtures; but, by means of Count Usedom, the Prussian Minister at Florence, he returned a vague and cautiously worded answer, asking for proofs of the existence of the alliance, which he already suspected.¹ Mazzini, however, could produce no proofs, though from the reports of his agents he knew that the idea of a war with Prussia had been spread throughout all the barracks in France, and that Victor Emmanuel had promised to make Italy take part in it. The matter was, therefore, soon allowed to drop, and Mazzini continued to work independently for the furtherance of his projects, making use of the Masonic lodges already established in Italy to diffuse as widely as possible his anti-Papal and anti-monarchical doctrines, and extending even among the ranks of the army and of the police the ramifications of a secret society entitled *l'Alleanza Universale Repubblicana*.²

Napoleon III. had hitherto been master of the situation in Italy; as long as his troops occupied the Papal territory, or were ready to return there whenever the independence of the Holy See was threatened, neither the secret intrigues of Mazzini nor the open aggression of Garibaldi, even though countenanced by the government of Victor Emmanuel, could destroy the Temporal Power of the Pope. But the complex and vacillating character of Napoleon III. made it impossible to reckon with confidence on his protection. In his youth he had been a member of the secret society known as the *Carbonari*, and had taken part in the insurrection of 1832 against Gregory XVI. Without his powerful aid when Emperor the Kingdom of Italy could never have been founded; but, though hostile to the temporal power, he considered himself bound to protect Pius IX., and not to allow him to be deprived of the last remnant of his

¹ *Politica Segreta Italiana*, p. 350. ² *id.* pp. 382-397.

sovereign authority. He hoped, apparently, that some compromise might be effected which, while satisfying the aspirations of Italian statesmen towards the unity of Italy, might still leave to the Pope a territory which, though small, would suffice to guarantee his independence; or that matters might remain as they were while Pius IX. lived, and that his successor might perhaps prove more yielding.¹ The influence of his Ministers, the Marquis de la Valette and M. Bénédicti, and of his cousin, Prince Napoleon, all three enemies of the temporal power, contributed also to impress on his policy a tendency favorable to the unity of Italy; while, on the other hand, the influence of the Empress and of the French clergy, and the dread of alienating the Catholics of France, prevented him from taking too actively the part of those who sought to despoil and enslave the Church, and the alternate preponderance in his council of these opposed tendencies may perhaps account for the variations in his policy with regard to the Holy See.

It was more especially towards the end of the Emperor's reign that the predominance of the Catholic element among his advisers made itself felt during the negotiations which took place concerning a Franco-Italian alliance, the first suggestion of which, according to Prince Napoleon,² was made by Victor Emmanuel in the course of 1868, with the object of finding a solution of the Roman question, though Mazzini stated in his letter to Bismarck that he knew that the Emperor had sought the alliance as far back as March, 1867. The matter was first vaguely discussed in a correspondence between the two sovereigns, and then in a more formal and official manner by their Ministers. At this stage of the proceedings the Austrian Government intervened and a treaty for an offensive and defensive alliance between France, Italy and Austria was drawn up, in which Italy exacted as an essential condition in return for her assistance the authorization for her troops to enter Rome after its evacuation by the French; and Austria, which was then ruled by a Liberal and anti-clerical parliamentary majority under the administration of Count von Beust, a Protestant from Saxony, approved and supported the demands of Italy.³ But Napoleon III., who, as has been stated, did not wish to abandon Pius IX., and who continued to entertain the hope that the election of another Pope more willing to come to terms with Italy, would extricate him from his embarrassing situation, refused to consent. The negotiations were suspended in June, 1869, until some more favorable opportunity, and General Menabrea, who had come to treat with the Emperor at Vichy, returned to Florence, saying as he took leave:

¹ Prince Napoleon, *Les Alliances de l'Empire*, p. 8. ² *id.* p. 11. ³ *id.* p. 15.

"May your Majesty never have reason to regret the 300,000 bayonets which I brought you."¹

The negotiations were resumed in the second week of July, 1870, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, by the Emperor, who sent to Florence and Vienna the draft of a treaty consisting of only three articles, by which, in return for the coöperation of an Italian army, he consented to withdraw the French troops from Rome and to trust to the honor and good faith of the Italian Government.² But to these three articles Italy, with the assent of Austria, added a fourth, by which France should agree to oblige Pius IX. to be reconciled with Italy and to yield up the Papal territory with the exception of Rome and its immediate environs. The Emperor, to his credit be it said, refused to accept this proposal, and on July 30 the Duc de Grammont replied: "If what is asked for is the entry of the Italians into Rome after the departure of our troops, it is impossible."³

The Emperor was already at Metz on his way to the army when, on August 3, Count Vimercati, the Italian envoy, brought him the draft of a new treaty, prepared by Count von Beust and Visconti-Venosta, by which Italy and Austria agreed to observe an armed neutrality, guaranteeing each other's territory and forming a triple alliance with France, as was proposed in 1869, in case the war were to acquire a greater development. France was again requested to conciliate the national rights of Italy with those of the Holy See, which meant practically that Pius IX. was to be abandoned and deprived of his States. But the Emperor still hesitated and sought various pretexts for not putting his name to the document; he objected to the form in which the treaty was drawn up; he asked to have its conditions modified, and though Prince Napoleon strongly urged him to sign it, he at last refused to do so, stating in a letter of that date to a friend that, in spite of all efforts of his cousin, he would not yield with regard to Rome.⁴ Count Vimercati left that evening with the unsigned treaty, and in a few days the Prussian victories of Wörth and Wissembourg put an end to all hope of aid from Italy or Austria.

The Emperor had, however, decided to recall the troops which occupied the Papal territory, and the Holy Father had been informed of his intention on July 27, the reason assigned for the withdrawal by the Duc de Grammont being that it was necessary, not from a strategical, but from a political point of view, for the purpose of conciliating Italy and assuring her neutrality. For, as the Duke remarked, the importance of the small detachment which

¹ G. Rothan, *Souvenirs diplomatiques*, *Revue des deux Mondes*, 15th November, 1884, p. 316. ² *id.*, p. 507. ³ *id.* p. 510. ⁴ Prince Napoleon, *Les Alliances de l'Empire*, p. 35.

then occupied the Papal territory was that it might be looked upon as the advanced guard of a French army which would hasten to support it in case it were attacked, a reinforcement which the war just beginning would render impossible, and it was advisable not to afford the Italian Government a pretext for setting aside the stipulations of the convention of September 15, 1864, by which it was bound to respect the Papal frontiers. In a subsequent dispatch addressed to the French envoy in Florence, he expressed the confidence which he felt that Italy would execute these stipulations with vigilance and firmness, and in reply Visconti-Venosta, the Foreign Minister, assured him that the King's government would conform strictly to the obligations imposed by the convention of 1864.¹

In spite of this declaration, the Italian Government was already preparing to invade the Papal States. On July 31 General Govone, the Minister of War, asked Parliament for a grant of sixteen millions of francs for the purpose of calling out and arming two levies of recruits, and on August 10, when the first French defeats had shown that there was not much danger of another intervention, the general asked for two more levies and a further grant of forty millions of francs. The French flag was lowered on the forts of Cività Vecchia as the last French soldiers quitted the Papal territory on August 12, and on the 14th General Cadorna took the command of the troops which were being gradually assembled at different points along the Papal frontier.² After the loss of the battle of Gravelotte on August 18, Napoleon III. made a last effort to obtain succor from Italy, for he knew that Victor Emmanuel was favorable to the idea in spite of the opposition of his Ministers, and on August 20 Prince Napoleon arrived in Florence as his envoy to request the armed intervention of Italy and Austria, with leave for Italy to act as she pleased with regard to Rome. The Prince, indeed, declares in his pamphlet that he would not have accepted the mission if he had not been allowed to give this authorization.³ But it was then too late, and the abandonment of the Papal territory, around which the invading army was taking up its positions, was a useless concession. Victor Emmanuel, it is true, was willing to do all in his power to aid France, but his Ministers and his generals remained inflexible;⁴ though, to gain time and to avoid offending an old ally by giving a positive refusal, an envoy was sent to Vienna to consult the Austrian Government. Before he could return the capitulation of Sédan and the fall of the Empire put an end to all further negotiations, and the Italian Government saw that the way to Rome lay open before it; for, though Jules Favre, the Foreign Minister of the

¹ De Beauffort, *Histoire de l'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 416. ² Tavallini id., vol. II. p. 14. ³ Prince Napoleon, id., p. 29. ⁴ Tavallini, *Vita di Lanza*, vol. I., p. 510.

newly inaugurated French Republic, twice refused to accede to the request of Cavaliere Nigra, the Italian Ambassador, and to consent to the occupation of Rome by the Italian troops, saying that he did not wish to cause any pain to the Sovereign Pontiff or to his own countrymen, at a third interview he yielded so far as to decline to interfere in the Roman question, and said that he would be pleased to see the government of Victor Emmanuel go to Rome.¹

Giovanni Lanza, the Prime Minister of Italy, had already taken the necessary precautions to hinder a premature invasion of the Papal territory under the leadership of Garibaldi, which would have probably resulted in the proclamation of that Republic for which Mazzini had been organizing so actively over all Italy his "*Allianza Repubblicana*," which reckoned among its adherents many sergeants and corporals of the royal army. Some republican manifestations had already taken place in Northern Italy, the most serious having been that of March 23 at Pavia, where the barracks were attacked, with the result that there were several killed and wounded, and a corporal who was found among the rebels was condemned to death and shot. Lanza therefore gave orders to have Garibaldi carefully watched in his island of Caprera, and to arrest Mazzini, who was known to be hiding in Genoa. The tools of the House of Savoy, which had helped to lay the foundations of the Kingdom of Italy, were now no longer needed; their assistance had even become dangerous, and the difficult operation of the completion of the edifice could not be entrusted to the dreamer of impossible Utopias or to the leader of undisciplined revolutionary bands. But Mazzini, in spite of the peremptory commands of Lanza to his subordinates, succeeded in leaving Genoa in disguise and with a false passport. The police failed to recognize him when the steamer on which he traveled touched at Naples, and he was only arrested on August 13 at Palermo, whence he was brought on a man-of-war to the fortress of Gaeta.²

Being thus freed from the dread of a republican movement, the Italian Ministry sought to obtain the approval of the rest of Europe for their sacrilegious aggression on the remaining possessions of the Holy See, and on August 29 Visconti-Venosta addressed a circular for that purpose to the representatives of the Italian Government at the different courts. In this document he accused the Holy See of adopting the attitude of a hostile government established in the centre of the peninsula and enlisting foreign soldiers, not to maintain order, but to carry out a crusade for the restoration of the ancient order of things in Italy. A lengthy memorandum joined to this circular gave an account of the negotiations which had taken

¹ Rothau, *id.*, p. 529. ² Tavallini, *Vita di G. Lanza*, vol. II., p. 9.

place since 1860 between France and Italy with regard to the Roman question, in which the obstinacy of the Papal Government was held responsible for the failure of the well-meant efforts of Napoleon III. and Victor Emmanuel to bring about a reconciliation between it and the Kingdom of Italy.¹ Another circular followed on September 7. The imperial government had fallen, and therefore Visconti-Venosta was still more outspoken in his calumnious denunciations. He declared that the unfertile and thinly inhabited tract of Italy which had been left to the Holy Father in 1860 was a serious danger for the rest of the country, as the territory of the theocratic government of the Sovereign Pontiff served as a basis of operations for all the elements of disorder, and the King was, therefore, under the necessity of taking steps to maintain peace and tranquility in the peninsula and to defend the Holy See. His Majesty did not even intend to wait till the actual outbreak of a struggle between the Romans and the foreign troops which might expose the Holy Father and the goods and the lives of his subjects to the dangers of a conflict much to be regretted, but when he judged fit he would occupy the positions requisite for the preservation of order.²

It is needless to observe that not the slightest disturbance had occurred or was likely to occur in Rome. The Œcumenical Council which had met on December 8, 1869, in St. Peter's, when the prelates assembled from all parts of the world to the number of over 700 presented the most magnificent and memorable spectacle ever witnessed in the Basilica, had proclaimed the dogma of the Papal infallibility on July 18, the day before France declared war against Prussia. Its sittings had then been suspended till the 11th of November, and the majority of its members had returned to their dioceses. The foreign visitors of all nations, who that year had been more numerous than usual, had also taken their departure, and the Eternal City was in that state of absolute tranquillity which recurred regularly every year during the intense heat of the summer months. Attempts had, indeed, been made to create disorder; the *Democrazia* of Florence stated in its number of August 31 that all the Roman emigrants, even those in the army, had been asked if they were willing to go to Rome to make demonstrations, and that those who consented had received money for the journey.³ During the course of the month some sentinels stationed in lonely parts of Rome had been fired upon, and the Italian flag had been hoisted during the night in some villages near the frontier, only to be speedily pulled down by the *gendarmes*, but these manifestations

¹ De Beaufort, *id.*, p. 434. ² *id.*, p. 452. ³ De Beaufort, *Histoire de l'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 57.

had met with no sympathy from the subjects of the Pope, and excited no revolutionary movement. Even when, at the end of the month, Menotti Garibaldi and some of his partisans came secretly to Rome they were soon discovered by the police and expelled without causing any disturbance. It was, indeed, said that the Italian Government had denounced them to the Papal authorities, for Menotti was more likely to conspire in favor of Mazzini's plans than of their own, and some time previously he had spoken of Lanza and his fellow-ministers as "that pack of rascals and thieves which calls itself the Italian Government."¹

It was on the 7th of September that these statesmen, finding that there was no prospect of an insurrection against the rule of Pius IX. and probably fearing that if France made peace with Prussia she might again be willing to defend the Holy Father, decided, as Visconti-Venosta stated in his circular of that date to the other European powers, not to wait till "the agitation reported to exist in the Papal territory, the natural consequence of the events taking place abroad, ended by causing bloodshed between the Romans and the foreign troops," and the invasion of the Papal States was decreed.

The anxiety which the Italian Ministry felt on the eve of this unprovoked aggression lest their victim should be snatched from their grasp, whether by an outburst of Catholic indignation or by a republican movement against the throne of Victor Emmanuel, is shown by the circular of September 5 addressed by Lanza to the provincial prefects, warning them to maintain order energetically and to repress any illegal manifestation or any attempt to imitate the republic just established in France.² The prefects of Caserta and Sassari were also specially requested to guard Mazzini and Garibaldi with the utmost vigilance, as their escape at that moment would be most embarrassing for the government. Another circular was sent by Raelli, the Minister of Justice, to the Bishops of Italy, assuring them that the government would guarantee to the Pope the greatest liberty for the exercise of his spiritual authority, and would not allow the slightest insult to be offered to the Church, but would not permit the clergy to censure the laws and the institutions of the State or to excite discontent. Any disobedience to these orders would be severely punished.³

Before, however, crossing the frontier the Italian Government made an attempt to persuade the Holy Father to abdicate voluntarily, and Count Ponza di San Martino, a man who when he had been Minister of the Interior had persecuted the religious orders,

¹ *Vita di Giovanni Lanza*, vol. I., p. 478. ² De Beauffort, *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 491. ³ *Id.*, p. 492.

was sent to Rome bearer of an autograph letter from Victor Emmanuel to Pius IX. In this document the King protested that he addressed the Holy Father with the affection of a son, with the faith of a Catholic, with the loyalty of a King and with the feelings of an Italian. He then brought forward again the false and absurd accusations so often repeated by his Ministers; namely, that the state of mind of the Papal subjects and the presence of the foreign soldiers were a cause of agitation and a danger to Italy which rendered it necessary for him to send his troops to occupy positions which would ensure the safety of His Holiness and the maintenance of order. He requested the Holy Father not to consider this measure of precaution as an act of hostility, for his government would protect the rights of the people and conciliate them with the inviolability of the Sovereign Pontiff, and he expressed the hope that the Holy Father's benevolent spirit, by satisfying the aspirations of the nation, would enable the Head of the Catholic Church to preserve on the banks of the Tiber a glorious dwelling independent of all human sovereignty. His Majesty concluded by asking for the Pope's blessing and declaring himself the most humble and obedient son of His Holiness. On reading this letter Pius IX. exclaimed: "Why this needless hypocrisy? Would it not be better to say frankly that he wants to deprive me of my kingdom?" He replied to the King's letter in a few eloquent and dignified lines, refusing to yield to his demands or even to discuss them and saying that he placed his cause in the hands of God, beseeching Him to bestow on the King the grace and the mercy of which he stood in need.

This embassy to Pius IX. was, it is said, not the only mission which Count Ponza di San Martino had to perform in Rome: he had been charged, it would seem, with the preparation of a revolutionary movement intended to facilitate the entrance of the royal troops; for *La Capitale*, one of the most violent organs of the advanced party, stated on September 28 that the Italian Government had given him a check for 600,000 francs to enable the Romans to purchase arms wherewith to repel the Papal mercenaries, and asked him what he had done with the money, since no revolt had taken place for want of arms; to which the Count replied that he had not cashed the check.¹ He had probably come to the conclusion that it would be useless to attempt to incite an insurrection in Rome on witnessing the enthusiasm with which an immense crowd of Romans greeted the Holy Father, when on the afternoon of September 10, the day on which he had received Victor Emmanuel's letter, he inaugurated on the Piazza de' Termini, close to the ruins of the Baths

¹ *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 93.

of Diocletian, the fountain known as the *Acqua Pia*. This vast basin, from the centre of which a group of jets of water shot high into the air, was the end of the conduit nearly sixty miles long which brought from its source in the mountains the water formerly carried by the ancient Roman aqueduct called the *Acqua Marcia*, ruined since many centuries; and it marked the completion of the last great undertaking accomplished for the good of the people by the government of Pius IX.

Count Ponza di San Martino left Rome on the 11th of September with the reply of the Holy Father to Victor Emmanuel, and on the same day the Italian troops received orders to cross the frontier. Pius IX. could expect no help from any of the other sovereigns; their answers to the circular of Visconti-Venosta were received by the Italian Government during the month of September, and it was not only the Protestant States which expressed their approval of the overthrow of the temporal power, as indeed might have been expected; but even the governments of the Catholic nations declined to interfere, accompanying their assurances of non-intervention with expressions of respect and sympathy for the Holy Father, of their confidence in the good feelings, the generosity and the honor of the Italian Government, and of their conviction that it was under the necessity of going to Rome, and that it would surround the Holy Father with all the guarantees requisite for the maintenance of his dignity and the untrammelled exercise of his spiritual authority. None of them uttered a protest against the misrepresentations and the calumnious accusations which the Italian Government had disseminated against the rule of the Sovereign Pontiff, or denounced the reported attempts to incite his subjects to rise in rebellion against him, or the unprovoked aggression on his States, without declaration of war, when these attempts had proved unavailing.

The army intended to operate against Rome was placed under the command of Lieutenant General Raffaele Cadorna. It consisted of the Fourth Army Corps, formed by the Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth Divisions, commanded by Lieutenant General Cosenz, a former Garibaldian officer; Major General Mazé de la Roche, and Major General Ferrero. There were besides two auxiliary divisions, the Second under Lieutenant General Bixio, also a former Garibaldian, and Lieutenant General Angioletti. These five divisions and the reserve comprised eighty battalions of infantry of the line, seventeen battalions of *bersaglieri*, 114 guns, twenty-seven squadrons of cavalry, four companies of engineers, five companies of the military train and one company of the pontoon train. The nominal strength of this army amounted to 81,478 men, giving as the effective strength, which is usually one-fifth less, at least 65,000

men.¹ Besides these troops, another body of over 10,000 men entered the Papal States in order to garrison the various towns and leave the whole of Cadorna's army free to march against Rome.

The small force which the Papal Government was able to oppose to the invasion had been much diminished by the departure of many of the Zouaves and of the *Légion d'Antibes* after the beginning of the Franco-German war, and was reduced to a nominal strength of 13,624 men, while the effective strength did not amount to much over 10,900. The Italians in this army were 8,309 (a proportion of 12 per 1,000 of the population),² the foreigners only 5,324, of whom 3,040 were Pontifical Zouaves. To these should be added the battalion of volunteers of the reserve, composed of 600 Romans armed and clothed at their own expense, and commanded by the Marchese Patrizi and Prince Lancillotti; and the Palatine Guard, also formed of Romans, who were on duty in the Vatican and in Saint Peter's on state occasions. As the detachments stationed at Civit  Vecchia, Bagnorea and Civit  Castellana were not able to retreat on Rome when the invasion took place, the number of soldiers available for the defense of the city did not amount at the time of the siege to more than 7,857; or, adding the volunteers and the officers, to about 10,000 men.³

Although Rome is surrounded by a wall, it cannot be considered as a fortified city capable of offering a serious resistance to a well-equipped army. It is only the portion situated on the right bank of the Tiber and known as the *Trastevere*, which is defended by modern fortifications provided with bastions, constructed under the reign of Urban VIII. (1623-1644); that on the left bank, by far the larger part of the city, is enclosed by a brick wall dating, for the most part, from the reigns of the Emperors Aurelian, Honorius and Justinian (270 A. D.—565 A. D.); surmounted with battlements and flanked at every 50 or 60 yards by square towers. In some places, as at the garden on the Pincian mount, to the north, these walls are strengthened by the hill behind them, of which they form the outer face, or by high ground a little in their rear, which might serve as a second line of defense, as in the neighborhood of the Porta San Paolo or the Porta San Sebastiano. But on all the eastern side of Rome the walls, without backing of earth and not commanded by buildings or heights, presented no such obstacles to an assailant, and the weakest part of all was that between the Porta Salara and the Porta Pia, about 300 yards in length. To defend this circuit of about thirteen miles there were only 160 guns, not more than fifty-four of which were rifled: the rest were for the most part antiquated

¹ *L'Invasion des  tats Pontificaux*, p. 112. ² *L'Invasion*, p. 121. ³ *Id.*, p. 192.

and hardly fit for use, and there were but 526 artillerymen to serve them.¹

It had been the original intention of General Cadorna to enter the Papal territory with his *corps d'armée* at Passo di Correse, on the left bank of the Tiber, at a distance of only two days' march from Rome, while General Bixio marched from Orvieto towards Cività Vecchia and General Angioletti advanced from the Neapolitan frontier towards Velletri, and his three divisions were already in the positions assigned to them when the Italian Government, guided, as it stated, by political motives, suddenly changed its plans and ordered the general to transfer his troops to the right bank of the Tiber at two points, Ponté Felice and Orte, eighteen and twenty-five miles higher up, and thence to march to Rome. The reason for this movement, so unadvisable from a military point of view, since it would necessitate the recrossing of the Tiber close to Rome, may perhaps have been the desire of affording the Holy Father more time to reflect on the impossibility of opposing any resistance to such greatly superior forces, and thereby persuade him to yield without fighting; or else the hope that, according as the different towns and villages along the line of march were annexed, anti-Papal demonstrations could be organized, the result of which would be to excite the populace of Rome and bring about that insurrection which the Italian politicians so ardently desired that they might have a pretext for their iniquitous invasion of the territory of the Church.²

General Bixio, who was the first to cross the frontier at 5 o'clock on the afternoon of September 11, had fought under Garibaldi at the siege of Rome in 1849, in the war against Austria in 1859 and in the expedition of Marsala against Francis II., when he was raised to the rank of lieutenant general, which he retained on being admitted into the regular army in 1862. He was a decided enemy of the Church, and had declared openly in Parliament that the Cardinals ought to be flung into the Tiber; and General Cadorna, knowing his violent character, had protested, but in vain, against his appointment to a command.³ The troops forming his division consisted of sixteen battalions of the line, three battalions of *bersaglieri*, six squadrons of cavalry, twenty-four guns and a company of engineers, amounting in all to about 13,000 combatants.

The small detachments of zouaves of twenty men each, stationed at Acquapendente and San Lorenzo, two villages close to the frontier, had already retreated to Montefiascone, held by Major de Suisy with two companies (173 men); but that at Bagnorea was surprised

¹ L'Invasion, p. 192. ² Cadorna, p. 105; De Beauffort, p. 116. ³ Cadorna, La Liberazione di Roma, p. 61 and p. 536.

by the sudden advance of Bixio's troops and obliged to lay down its arms. On the following day Bixio turned aside from the road leading to Viterbo and, leaving one battalion to threaten that town, he passed along the southern shore of the lake of Bolsena, marching towards Corneto on the road to Cività Vecchia, where he hoped to intercept Lieutenant Colonel de Charette as he retreated towards Rome. De Charette, who held Viterbo with four companies of zouaves (396 men), forty gendarmes and forty artillerymen with two guns and a *mitrailleuse*, had been ordered to withdraw according as the Italian army advanced, and on being informed of the invasion he recalled the garrison of Montefiascone and prepared to retire. The Piedmontese columns were already in sight about noon on the 12th. The detachment left behind by Bixio was advancing from Montefiascone, and the troops of General Ferrero belonging to Cadorna's army were approaching from Orte, where they had that morning crossed the Tiber. It was only when they were close to the northern and eastern gates of the town that de Charette, who had taken up a position on a height outside the walls, marched away by the road to Vetralla, where he arrived that evening. There he was joined by about 200 gendarmes collected from their stations in the surrounding country, and the next morning he continued his march towards Cività Vecchia, meeting everywhere with the utmost cordiality and assistance in the way of provisions and transport from the inhabitants of the villages through which he passed.¹ But his further progress was stopped at Monte Romano, for there he learned that the advanced posts of Bixio's troops, which from Marta on the lake of Bolsena had marched through Toscanella to Corneto, had seized the roads leading to Cività Vecchia, and left him no means of escape except through a wild and mountainous district through which it seemed impossible for heavily laden troops to make their way. It was, however, through this labyrinth of wooded hills and precipitous ravines, across which the guns and the baggage wagons were dragged by the soldiers, that de Charette led his 900 men by a daring and fatiguing march of twelve hours, the greater part of which took place during the night. At one point, from the summit of a height, the camp fires of the enemy were seen in the plain below; but no alarm was given, and at 4 o'clock on the morning of the 14th the detachment entered Cività Vecchia, whence that afternoon it proceeded to Rome.²

The garrison of Cività Vecchia was composed of the four companies of zouaves which formed the *dépôt*, three companies of *cacciatori*, half a squadron of dragoons, four sections of artillery with eight field pieces, some gendarmes and *squadrilieri*, in all between

¹ L'Invasion, p. 136. ² J. Powell, Two Years in the Pontifical Zouaves, p. 251.

800 and 900 men.¹ The fortifications which had been recently enlarged were defended by 120 guns, but there were not artillerymen enough to work them. On the morning of the 15th the Italian fleet which, under the command of Vice Admiral del Carretto, had been cruising for some days off the coast of the Papal territory, drew nearer to Civit  Vecchia. It consisted of twelve vessels, ten of which were iron-clads, carrying 105 guns and 4,295 men, and it took up its position opposite the town in order to co perate with General Bixio. The commander of the place, Colonel Serra, a Spanish officer who had distinguished himself in the campaign of 1860, had declared to the foreign Consuls that he would defend the town according to the orders which he had received from Rome, and on the approach of the Italian advanced guard the gates were closed, the guns were manned and every preparation was made to repel an attack. But when General Bixio sent an officer of his staff to demand the surrender of the town and threatened to bombard it if it did not capitulate within twelve hours, the entreaties of the terrified citizens and the noisy demonstrations of the populace so prevailed over the colonel's sense of duty and honor that in spite of the indignant protests of Major d'Albiousse, the commander of the zouaves, he consented to give up the town without firing a shot.

The invasion of the southern portion of the Papal territory took place at 8 o'clock on the morning of the 12th, when General Angioletti entered the province of Frosinone at the head of the Ninth Division, consisting of sixteen battalions of infantry, two battalions of *bersaglieri*, eighteen guns, six squadrons of cavalry and a company of engineers, in all about 12,000 men. According as he advanced he established provisional governments in the different towns, and on the 19th his troops encamped about three miles from Rome.

The province of Frosinone as well as that of Velletri were under the command of Colonel Azzanesi, whose troops, which did not amount to 2,000 men, were all Italian, and as he had been ordered to withdraw before the superior forces of the enemy without offering any resistance, he recalled his outlying detachments stationed along the frontier, falling back with them gradually on Velletri, whence they were conveyed to Rome by rail. One of these detachments, commanded by Major Lauri, of the gendarmes, was intercepted on its way by Angioletti's advanced guard, and in order to escape had to make a dangerous night march like that of Colonel de Charette through the rugged and intricate range of mountains which lies to the south of Velletri; and it is a remarkable fact that, with every facility for deserting and with the certainty that in presence of such

¹ L'Invasion des  tats Pontificaux, p. 147.

an overwhelming hostile force the Papal cause was hopelessly lost, not one of his soldiers, all Italians and Papal subjects, abandoned his flag to pass over to the enemy.¹

In the meanwhile the army of General Cadorna, consisting of forty-eight battalions of infantry, twelve of *bersaglieri*, seventy-two guns, fourteen squadrons of cavalry, two companies of engineers, three of the military train, a company of the pontoon train and a squadron of guides, in all about 35,000 men, had crossed the Tiber at dawn on the morning of the 12th. The Thirteenth Division, under Major General Ferrero, which had seized the bridge at Orte during the night, marched on Viterbo, whence, as we have seen, Colonel de Charette retreated on its approach, while the Eleventh Division, under General Cosenz, and the Twelfth, under General Mazé de la Roche, crossed at Ponte Felice and advanced towards Cività Castellana. The town, which occupies the site of an ancient Etruscan city, stands upon a high table-land of rock surrounded on three sides by deep ravines, and the road from Ponte Felice crosses that lying to the north by a bridge 120 feet high. The fort which gives its name to the town was built in the fifteenth century by Antonio San Gallo for Alexander VI. and enlarged by Julius II. and Leo X. It had served for a long time as a civil and military prison, and contained at the time of the invasion a company of discipline of seventy men belonging to different regiments and 180 convicts. The garrison consisted of Captain de Résimont's company of zouaves (110 men) and twenty-five gendarmes and *squadriglieri*. Warned on the night of the 11th that the enemy was about to cross the frontier, Captain de Résimont stationed a detachment of zouaves in a Capuchin convent situated beyond the bridge and commanding the road leading to it, and when General Cadorna's advanced guard appeared it was received with a heavy fire. The post could not, however, be long defended, for a battalion had been sent by a narrow path leading from the high road down into the ravine to turn the position, and two other battalions which had crossed the Tiber by a railway bridge lower down had already occupied the road leading to Rome and were about to enter the town. The zouaves then retreated into the castle, on which a battery of six guns, strengthened shortly after by two more batteries, and screened by the surrounding gardens and plantations, opened fire from a distance of 1,000 yards. The garrison, which had no artillery, could only reply with musketry, and thus inflicted very little damage on the enemy; but when, after a bombardment of two hours, during which more than 400 cannon balls had been fired against the fortress and 240 shells had burst within its circuit, the

¹ *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 161.

massive towers were on the point of falling and the lives of the prisoners were in danger, Captain de Résimont and Lieutenant Sevilla, who had already refused to capitulate when requested by the Governor of the prison, consented at last to treat with General Cadorna. The general complimented the Papal troops on the gallant resistance which they had opposed to such greatly superior forces, and the next day the garrison marched out with the honors of war, and having laid down their arms were brought as prisoners to Spoleto, whence the foreign soldiers were sent to their homes. On the side of the Italians the loss had been ten killed and wounded; of the zouaves only five had been wounded.¹

On the same day General Cadorna received orders from the Minister of War to advance by forced marches to Rome, and his troops, taking two days' rations with them and leaving all their baggage behind, started at noon and encamped that night at Monterosi, about twenty-two miles from Rome. They continued their march next morning at 3, and halted that afternoon about ten miles from Rome, where General Cadorna established his headquarters at a wayside inn named *La Storta*. An advanced guard of nine squadrons of cavalry and six guns, commanded by General Chevilly, had preceded them, and on arriving near Rome had sent detachments to patrol the roads in the environs of the city. It was then 8 o'clock, and the mists which float over the Campagna in the early morning had not yet passed away, so that they were not perceived till they were close to the outpost of a company of zouaves stationed at the Convent of Sant' Onofrio, a few miles to the northwest of Rome. Sergeant Shea, who commanded the post, went forward with four men to demand the watchword, but was surrounded, severely wounded and made prisoner with his men after a desperate resistance. The rest of the company retreated upon Rome after having inflicted some loss on the enemy and taken their lieutenant, Count Crotti di Costigliole. The father of this officer sat in the Italian Parliament, where he had distinguished himself by his eloquence in defense of the rights of the Church, and he died suddenly a few days after the taking of Rome, most probably from the grief and indignation caused by the spoliation of the Holy See.²

The anxiety of the Italian Ministers to induce Pius IX. to yield on the question of the temporal power and to condone the sacrilegious aggression of the House of Savoy by the voluntary cession of the territory of the Church, was again rendered evident by the action of General Cadorna, who before undertaking the difficult operation of transferring his army from the right to the left bank of the Tiber, tried to accomplish the object of the campaign by diplo-

¹ *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 179. ² *Id.*, p. 156.

macy rather than by violence. On the 15th he sent one of his staff officers, Lieutenant Colonel Count Caccialupi, with a letter to General Kanzler, asking him in the name of the King of Italy to allow his troops to occupy Rome, assuring him that their object was purely to maintain order, and that the Italian officers of the Papal army would be allowed to preserve their rank, while the foreign soldiers would be sent to their respective countries; to which General Kanzler simply replied that the Holy Father preferred to see Rome occupied by his own troops, and not by those of another sovereign. In spite of this rebuff General Cadorna sought once more to overcome the resistance of the Papal Government, and on the following day he sent Major General Carchidio to inform General Kanzler of the taking of Civit  Vecchia, and to request him again to admit the Italian troops into Rome, appealing at the same time to his feelings of humanity and pointing out to him that resistance was useless in presence of the superior force assembled round the city. General Kanzler in his reply remarked that the loss of Civit  Vecchia could have no influence on the defense of Rome, and he reminded the Italian general that the Holy See had not provoked this war, and that it was rather for the invaders to show their humane feelings by desisting from an unjust aggression.

In the meanwhile preparations were actively carried on by Cadorna's orders for throwing a pontoon bridge across the Tiber near a farm called Grotta Rossa, about four miles above Rome; the steep banks of the river had been cut down to allow of easy access to it, and roads to connect it with the high road constructed across the fields. At nightfall three battalions of *bersaglieri* were ferried across to protect the working party. Nine other battalions followed about midnight, when the bridge was completed, and they seized the bridges over the Aniene to guard against an attack from the garrison of Rome.¹ The rest of the army followed in the course of the 17th, and on the evening of the 18th the Eleventh Division was encamped on the *Via Salara* nearest to the Tiber, the Twelfth on the *Via Nomentana* and the Thirteenth on the *Via Tiburtina*, where its left was in touch with the troops of the Ninth Division under General Angioletti, which on arriving from the southern provinces took up their positions on the *Via Latina*. Bixio, too, received orders to hasten forward with the Second Division, and on the evening of the 19th his troops were seen advancing on the road from Civit  Vecchia.

As all the applications made directly by the Italian Government had failed to persuade Pius IX. to lay down his sovereign power and to allow the army of Victor Emmanuel to occupy Rome, an-

¹ Cadorna, p. 169.

other attempt to treat was made through the intervention of Count von Arnim, the Prussian Minister at the Vatican, and at that moment, owing to the absence of the Austrian Ambassador, the head of the diplomatic body in Rome. Taking upon himself, apparently unsolicited, to negotiate in the interests of Italy, he came to General Cadorna while he was watching his troops crossing the Tiber, and asked him to put off the attack on Rome for twenty-four hours, as he hoped by applying directly to Pius IX. to persuade him to cease a resistance which was altogether owing to the predominant influence of the military party among his advisers.¹ General Cadorna was only too happy to grant his request, not only because he was aware that the Italian Ministers would much prefer to obtain possession of Rome without fighting, but also, as he confesses in his report of the campaign, because he would require more than twenty-four hours to place his troops in the positions they were to occupy and give their officers time to study the ground over which they were to operate. Count von Arnim's mendacious assertion with regard to the pressure brought to bear on the Holy Father by the "foreign mercenaries" was a favorite theme with the revolutionary politicians and journalists, who tried to explain the constancy with which Pius IX. guarded the possessions of the Church by spreading the report that Colonel de Charette and the zouaves refused to obey the orders of the Pope to lay down their arms, and that they were masters of Rome and terrorized the citizens.² This calumnious statement was soon after publicly refuted in the principal journals of Europe by Count Blume, a former Austrian Minister, then present in Rome. Count von Arnim's efforts to persuade Pius IX. to abandon his temporal power met with no more success than the previous endeavors of Ponza di San Martino and Cadorna, and the Italian Ministry, perceiving that there was no hope of entering Rome peaceably, ordered their general to take the city by force, with the exception of *la Città Leonina*, or that part of the *Trastevere* which encloses the Castle of St. Angelo, St. Peter's and the Vatican, reminding him at the same time that the political situation demanded prudence, moderation and dispatch. Another telegram on the following day informed him that from the political point of view delay might be fatal.³

Within Rome all was quiet; the people showed no disposition to facilitate the entrance of the Italian army by an insurrection against the Papal troops; but when a *triduo* was held in St. Peter's at the altar of *la Madonna della Colonna* the Romans flocked thither in crowds, through which the Swiss Guards could hardly make a way

¹ Cadorna, p. 171. ² Italian Correspondence of September 18 and 19 in the *London Times* of September 24 and 27, 1870; *La Nazione* of Florence, September 19, 1870. ³ Cadorna, p. 185.

for the Holy Father, and when, a few days later, on the feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, he visited the Church of *Ara Cali*, he was received with enthusiastic applause by the throngs which lined the streets. The preparations for the defense of Rome were still actively carried on; by a proclamation of General Kanzler the city was declared to be in a state of siege; the gates were closed with the exception of six, in front of which earthworks were thrown up and armed with artillery; the troops left their barracks and bivouacked at the various points where an attack was to be apprehended; and posts of observation were established on the cupola of St. Peter's and the belfries of the Lateran and Sta. Maria Maggiore, which were put in telegraphic communication with the Ministry of War and the Vatican.

General Cadorna had given orders to begin the attack at dawn on the 20th, and his troops took up their positions in the course of the two preceding days. On the right of the besieging army General Cosenz placed the batteries of the Eleventh Division at 500 yards from the Porta Salara; twelve pieces of heavy artillery under General Corte, destined to make a breach in the wall between the Porta Salara and the Porta Pia, were stationed on some rising ground about 1,000 yards away, and six others at 400 yards. General Mazé de la Roche was to attack the Porta Pia with the three batteries of the Twelfth Division, and the infantry of the line and the *bersaglieri* of these divisions, together with the six battalions of *bersaglieri* of the reserve, the cavalry and the *ambulances*, were drawn up in the rear near the Church of St. Agnes, while Cadorna fixed his headquarters at the Villa Albani. To the left General Ferrero, with the Thirteenth Division, was to attack the Porta Maggiore and the opening in the city wall called *I tre Archi*, through which passed the railway to Naples; General Angioletti, with the Ninth Division, was to cannonade the Porta San Giovanni and the salient angle where is situated Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, while Bixio's guns were to be directed against the line of bastions on the right bank of the Tiber. The real attack was that against Porta Pia and the adjacent wall; the others were intended to divert the attention of the besieged and oblige them to scatter their forces.¹ While the Italian army was thus drawing nearer to the walls of the Eternal City, Count von Arnim made a last effort to persuade Pius IX. to lay down his sovereignty and surrender his temporal power, seeking to alarm him by pointing out that if Victor Emmanuel were unable to make Rome the capital of Italy, the proclamation of an Italian Republic was inevitable, which would be far more dangerous for the Holy See. But Pius IX. was neither to be deceived by diplomacy nor intimi-

¹ *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 263.

dated by threats, and the arguments of Count von Arnim were unsuccessful, as was also his attempt to induce the rest of the diplomatic body in Rome to support his demand by signing an address to the Pope with the same object.¹

When the Holy Father was informed that Rome was to be bombarded on the following day he addressed to General Kanzler a letter, in which in dignified and solemn words he bade farewell to his army. His object had been attained; he had obliged the enemies who had approached his throne with feigned respect and perfidious offers of protection to cast aside the mask and show themselves in their real character of oppressors and spoliators of the Church. He knew, indeed, that with his small army a prolonged resistance could have no other result than a useless shedding of blood; but he was resolved that if the House of Savoy was to usurp the temporal power entrusted to his keeping, it should be in virtue of superior might, not in consequence of any abdication on his part or any failure to perform their duty on the part of his soldiers; and he, therefore, commanded that as soon as a breach was opened in the walls the garrison should capitulate.

During the 19th the movements of the enemy were carefully watched from the ramparts, and when possible a shell or a volley of musketry was directed against the detachments of Italian troops which advanced to occupy the surrounding villas; and that night the sentinels on the walls could see close at hand the watch fires of the outposts and hear the distant rolling of the artillery as it took up the positions where the batteries were to be established.

It was not yet daylight when, at 5 o'clock on the morning of the 20th, General Ferrero's three batteries opened fire on the earthwork armed with two guns and a howitzer which protected the three arches by which the railway enters Rome, and at the same time General Angioletti began to bombard the Porta San Giovanni, defended by two guns in the earthwork covering the gate and by two more guns and a howitzer mounted on the adjacent rampart; but his attack on the Porta San Sebastiano did not begin till about an hour later. The guns at the *Tre Archi* were soon put out of action by the masses of brick and stone which fell round them as the walls crumbled away under the heavy and well directed fire of the Italians, and the two companies of Swiss Carabineers, two of infantry of the line and two of zouaves, which under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Castella defended the position, could only reply with musketry. The walls were already tottering and two companies of Italian infantry were held in readiness to give the

¹ *L'Invasion des États Pontificaux*, p. 254; *Ideville*, p. 180.

assault, when, at 10 o'clock, a dragoon brought a verbal order to cease all resistance, which the lieutenant colonel refused to obey, and it was only on receiving a written order half an hour later that he displayed the white flag, when the firing ceased, and at noon further orders made the troops abandon the post and retreat to Sta. Maria Maggiore.¹

The Porta San Giovanni was guarded by some companies of Swiss Carabineers, one of zouaves and one of *squadriglieri*, under Lieutenant Colonel de Charette. They were soon obliged by General Angioletti's more powerful artillery to withdraw their guns from the earthwork before the gate and place them on the bastion beside it, where they were reinforced by four mountain pieces under Captain Daudier. But, though the Papal guns were few, their fire was so skilfully directed by their officers, Prince Rospigliosi and Count Macchi, that three of the enemy's guns were dismounted, two ammunition wagons were blown up and the Italian batteries were three times forced to change their position. The neighboring Basilicas narrowly escaped destruction. More than fifty shots struck that of St. John of Lateran.

Some of the side chapels in Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme were laid in ruins and a shell burst in the Passionist Convent near the Santa Scala, wounding one of the monks and killing Lieutenant Piccadori, of the Pontifical dragoons. Though the gates of the Porta San Giovanni took fire and fell, the Papal soldiers still maintained an obstinate resistance until de Charette received the written order to cease the combat and some time after another commanding him to retire with his men to the *Città Leonina*.²

The troops stationed at the Porta San Sebastiano and the Porta San Paolo withdrew at the same time; they had so well defended the approaches to those gates by two guns placed on the bastion of San Gallo that four of General Angioletti's guns stationed near the tomb of Cecilia Metella on the Appian way were obliged to change their positions several times, but at 10 o'clock the order came to cease fire and had to be obeyed.

General Bixio had been instructed to set his troops in movement as soon as he heard the first cannon shot fired by General Ferrero, and it was therefore about half-past 6 when his four batteries opened fire against the Porta San Pancrazio and the fortifications which crown the heights of the Janiculum. This part of the city, under the command of Colonel Azzanesi, was defended by native troops, the *cacciatori* under Lieutenant Colonel Sparagana and the regiment of the line under Lieutenant Colonel Tanetti, and in spite of the efforts which had been made to turn them away from their allegiance

¹ De Beauffort, *L'Invasion*, p. 272. ² *id.*, pp. 277 and 279.

to Pius IX.,¹ they performed their duty as courageously and as loyally as any of the foreign soldiers. Only fifteen of the guns, mostly smooth-bores mounted on bastions, could reply to the twenty-four pieces of General Bixio, but the fire of the Papal infantry was so heavy and so well aimed that his *bersaglieri* were driven back, and his batteries, which he had placed at 400 yards from the walls, had to be withdrawn to 1,200. General Cadorna in his report on the campaign blames severely the recklessness with which Bixio exposed his soldiers to a cross-fire from the ramparts and from the *Città Leonina*, losing thereby more killed and wounded than General Cosenz; and more killed than General Mazé de la Roche, whose troops had taken part in the assault.² The fire of Bixio's artillery, whether wilfully or through carelessness, was also badly directed, so that while the bombardment carried on by the other generals injured only the fortifications and caused but little damage to the buildings of Rome, Bixio's shells set fire to a cloth manufactory near the Porta San Pancrazio, to a house in the Piazza Navona, to a house and a forage store in the Via Lungara and to several houses in the Via Giulia, where a woman was killed in the street. Four more shells fell on the Convent of San Callisto, several on the hospital of San Gallicano, where the sick had to be carried down into the cellars, and in another hospital a patient was killed in his bed.³

As has been already mentioned, the real attack was directed against the Porta Pia and the adjacent walls. An earthwork holding two rifled guns had been raised before the gate, and a third gun was stationed to its right. Three guns on the terrace of the Pincian mount, one in the garden of the Villa Medici and six in the great square enclosure which advances beyond the line of the walls and is known as the Prætorian Camp, commanded the approaches to the gate, while a detachment of zouaves and another of Swiss Carabineers held the gardens of the Villa Patrizi some distance beyond the walls. General Cadorna's batteries, mounting fifty-four guns, opened fire soon after 5 o'clock, but his artillerymen were much incommoded by the musketry from the Villa Patrizi, which the Thirty-fifth Battalion of *bersaglieri* was sent to take, and succeeded in occupying after a stubborn resistance. Shortly before 7 one of the guns at the Porta Pia was dismounted; it was soon replaced, but an hour later another met the same fate, and the earthwork was in such a ruinous condition that it was abandoned; but the musketry fire was maintained from the walls, where no guns could be mounted, and the Italian pieces, which had advanced to 600 yards from the city,

¹ Roman Correspondence in London *Times*, September 29, 1876. ² Cadorna, p. 191. ³ Le Deauffort, p. 283.

were obliged to recede to 800 yards and then to 1,200, though even at that distance the Remington bullets caused the Italians some loss. To the left of the Porta Pia, on the terrace of the Pincio, which was raked by artillery stationed in the Villa Borghese, some of the guns, on account of the want of artillerymen, were served by zouaves, several of whom, as well as two of their officers, Lieutenants Niel and Brondoio, were severely wounded; and to the right, at the Prætorian Camp, where embrasures had been opened in the walls, the few guns available replied steadily to General Ferrero's batteries as they cannonaded the three railway arches.

It was not long, however, before the ancient wall between the Porta Pia and the Porta Salara began to crumble away beneath the fire of the heavy siege pieces; the Villa Bonaparte in its rear was in flames; the breach was already opened about 9 o'clock, and the Italian infantry, approaching through the grounds of the neighboring villas, formed in columns for the assault. Just before 10 General Botacco reported that the breach, then widened to the extent of thirty yards, was practicable, and Cadorna, hoisting a flag on the tower of the Villa Patrizi, signaled to his artillery to cease fire and to the attacking columns to advance.¹ The Thirty-ninth Infantry Regiment, covered by the fire of the *bersaglieri* stationed in the Villa, ran forward immediately to storm the Porta Pia, while a detachment from the division of Mazé de la Roche, with the Twelfth *bersaglieri* at its head, and another from the division of Cosenz, led by the Thirty-fourth *bersaglieri*, passing through openings made in the walls of the surrounding gardens, rushed towards the breach. A few minutes previously a dragoon galloping up to the Porta Pia had brought a verbal order from General Zappi to raise the white flag, since the breach had been opened; but Major de Troussures, who commanded at the gate, declined to obey except on a written order, and sent Lieutenant van der Kerchove to the general. The two companies of Captains de Gastebois and de Couëssin, stationed to right and left of the gate, maintained in the meantime a rapid fire and kept the hostile column at bay till the officer's return with the order to surrender. The white flag was then displayed and the combat ceased. The companies of Captains Thomalé, Berger and Desclée, reckoning in all about 250 men, which held the breach, though losing heavily under fire of the *bersaglieri* as they advanced, and of the sharpshooters in the neighboring vineyards, made an obstinate resistance, before which the assaulting column recoiled with the loss of its leader, Major Pagliari, two other officers and several men. At that moment a staff officer brought the order to cease fire, the white flag was raised and the troops grounded arms. The

¹ Cadorna, p. 197.

Italians then crossed the breach, still firing on the zouaves, who could not reply (Cadorna confesses that his soldiers did not perceive the white flag); they insulted the Papal officers and deprived them of their swords and their revolvers; they flung one of them from his horse, which was seized by an Italian officer, and then led their prisoners towards the Porta Pia. There, too, the suspension of hostilities was not observed, and in spite of the white flag two zouaves were killed in the ranks by the *bersaglieri*, who fired as they entered. One of their officers discharged his revolver on Lieutenant van der Kerchove and another tore Captain de Couëssin's cross and medals from his breast. One officer alone drove back his men with the flat of his sword and obliged them to respect the prisoners; the other *bersaglieri*, both officers and men, loaded them with insults, but the infantry of the line showed them more consideration.¹ The Italian troops then, in defiance of the usages of civilized warfare, according to which, when a besieged town hangs out a white flag, there is a truce and the contending forces remain in their respective positions until the capitulation is signed, pressed on into the city and occupied the Quirinal, the garden of the Pincio, the Piazza del Popola and the Piazza Colonna. As they approached, most of the Papal troops, informed of the surrender, fell back on the *Città Leonina*, as they had been directed to do, not only unmolested by the people, but greeted with courtesy and sympathy as they passed through the thoroughly Roman quarter of the *Trastevere*.² Several companies, however, surrounded in the positions which they occupied, were obliged to lay down their arms, and were brought to the Prætorian Camp.

Thus, after a bombardment by 114 guns during five hours, was Rome taken; though, as General Cadorna stated in an order of the day to his soldiers, it had been stubbornly defended (*ostinatamente difesa*). The losses of the Italian army, according to some of their own officers, amounted to 2,000 men; according to the official report there were only 32 killed and 143 wounded.³ Those of the Papal troops were 16 killed and 58 wounded, and even the journals most hostile to the cause of the Holy See rendered justice to their gallantry. According to the Neapolitan journal *La Soluzione*, "they did their duty with modesty and bravery like heroes; the defense of Rome was courageous and brilliant; they were resolved to die on the walls if the Holy Father had not ordered them to surrender;" and *L'Italie*, a Florentine paper, stated that "they fought with a courage and coolness which commands our respect. . . . The zouaves fought like brave men; they proved it at the Porta Pia and the Villa Bonaparte, as I saw with my own eyes."⁴

¹ De Beaufort, p. 303. ² Id., p. 338. ³ Cadorna, p. 484. ⁴ De Beaufort, p. 312.

Pius IX. had requested the representatives of the foreign powers to assemble at the Vatican as soon as the bombardment began; they assisted at his Mass which he said at the usual hour of half-past 7, while the thunder of Bixio's guns was resounding through the palace, and after Mass he conversed with them in his library, from the windows of which might be seen the columns of smoke rising from the houses set on fire by the shells. The Holy Father spoke of various incidents of his past life; of his visit to Chili in his youth; of the meeting of the diplomatic body at the Quirinal under similar circumstances in 1848, and of the display of the flags of various nations for the protection of foreign residents, which he had seen in the streets of Rome, contrasting it with the decorations made in honor of his return from Gaeta. He mentioned, also, that the students of the American Seminary had asked to be allowed to take arms, but that he had thanked them and told them to take part in assisting the wounded. Just before 10 Count Carpegna, a staff officer, brought word that the breach had been opened and was practicable. The Pope conferred with Cardinal Antonelli for a few minutes, and then, turning to the Ambassadors with tears in his eyes, informed them that he had given orders to capitulate, as any further resistance would cause great bloodshed, which he wished to avoid. "It is not for myself I weep," continued Pius IX., "but for these poor children who have come to defend me as their Father. Will each of you take charge of those of your own country? They are of all nations. And think also, I beg of you, of the English and the Canadians, whose interests are not represented here." Cardinal Antonelli then reminded the Pope that in the absence of Mr. Odo Russell they would be cared for by an English *chargé d'affaires*, and the Holy Father said: "I recommend them to you that you may preserve them from the ill-treatment which others of them suffered some years ago." He then declared that he released his soldiers from their oath of allegiance, in order to leave them at liberty; and he dismissed the envoys, requesting them to agree with General Kanzler with regard to the terms of the capitulation.¹

When, according to the orders of the Holy Father, the white flag had been raised on the cupola of St. Peter's and on the Castle of St. Angelo, General Kanzler sent two officers of his staff, Lieutenant Colonel Carpegna and Major Rivalta, with a letter to General Cadorna to discuss the terms of the surrender of Rome, which the general consented to do, but which he seemed to consider a great concession on his part, since his troops already held the city. General Kanzler soon followed his delegates, as well as the diplomatic body, whose interference in the negotiations Cadorna refused to

¹ De Beaufort, p. 323.

allow; but with the Papal general he concluded a capitulation, according to which Rome, with the exception of the Leonine City, was to the frontiers of their country, and the native soldiers were to be given up to the Italians, the garrison was to march out with the honors of war, the foreign troops were to be sent at once by rail remain in a *dépôt* till the government had come to a decision as to their future position. General Cadorna states in his history of the campaign that the brigades furnished by each division for the occupation of Rome were directed to place guards over the churches, monasteries and public buildings for their protection and for the maintenance of order; but it is not the less true that in the rear of his troops came some four or five thousand Garibaldians, the scum of the great cities of Italy, and many political exiles, who, though he had requested them not to compromise his cause by rendering themselves guilty of excesses,¹ joined with the rabble of Rome in heaping every sort of insult and outrage on the defenders of the Pope as they were led disarmed and prisoners through the streets, while in some cases the *bersaglieri* forming their escort either did not protect the Papal soldiers or even, it is asserted, took part in these manifestations of vindictiveness.²

With the exception of the companies which had been surrounded and disarmed in the neighborhood of the Porta Pia, and who rejoined their comrades later, the Papal troops had assembled in the Leonine City, which had been reserved to the Pope by the terms of the capitulation, and they passed the night in front of St. Peter's, where, on the great feasts of the Church, they had often knelt while, from the Loggia far overhead, the voice of Pius IX. resounded through the vast Piazza as he pronounced the benediction "*Urbi et Orbi.*" Just before mid-day on the 21st the bugles called the troops to arms and they formed their ranks for the last time. The *Légion d'Antibes* was drawn up at the foot of the steps of the basilica; in their rear the Swiss, then the zouaves, the infantry of the line, the *cacciatori*, the dragoons and the artillery. At the word of command, the bayonets were fixed and the troops were on the point of marching when one of the windows of the Vatican was thrown open and Pius IX. appeared. A cry of "*Vive Pie IX.*" burst from the soldiers, accompanied by the crash of a volley of musketry as the men of the *Légion d'Antibes* and the Swiss fired off their rifles in the air, while the Holy Father, stretching out his hand, gave his army a last blessing, and then fell back fainting into the arms of his attendants.

To avoid all danger of a collision with the populace it had been decided that the Papal troops should not pass through Rome; they

¹ Cadorna, p. 183. ² De Beauffort, p. 332.

went out, therefore, by the Porta Angelica, and followed the road which runs at the foot of the ramparts of the Leonine City till they reached the Porta San Pancrazio, a distance of about three miles. There, between the two bastions nearest to the gate, were General Cadorna and the other generals of the Italian army on horseback, and near them, on foot, Generals Zappi and de Courten. On both sides of the road were drawn up lines of Italian infantry, the bands playing, the men presenting arms as the Pontifical troops marched past. Then, turning away from the walls of Rome, each regiment laid down its arms in the Villa Belvedere, and the disbanded troops, to the number of perhaps 8,000, streamed away silently across the parched up fields of the Campagna, towards the station of Ponte Galera, nine or ten miles distant. Conveyed thence in several trains to Cività Vecchia, the native soldiers were sent to the fortress of Alexandria, in North Italy; the foreigners, classified according to their nationality, were lodged, some in the forts and others in the convict prison. A few days later the French zouaves left for France; one of their captains had succeeded in concealing and carrying away the flag of the regiment; it was unfolded and saluted for the last time on board the steamer, and then divided among the officers. Colonel de Charette soon reorganized his men; their numbers were augmented by fresh recruits, and under the name of *Les Volontaires de l'Ouest* they upheld worthily the reputation of the regiment in the Franco-German war, especially on the stubbornly contested fields of Loigny and Patay. The other prisoners were brought by sea to Genoa, where the Belgians and Dutch were quartered in the fort of *Monte Ratti*, the English and Irish in the barracks of *San Benigno*, whence, after a few days, they departed for their homes. The Italian soldiers of the Pontifical army were for the most part detained for a considerable time in the fortresses of North Italy before being set free, and the *squadriglieri*, or armed mountaineers, who were more especially the objects of the hatred and the calumnies of the revolutionary party, on account of the efficacious assistance they had rendered to the Pontifical gendarmes in the suppression of brigandage, thereby depriving the Italian Government of every pretext of crossing the frontier, were treated with a harshness totally contrary to the terms of the capitulation: they were accused of being brigands; they were made to associate with galley slaves; and when they were at last released, some of them after two years' detention, they were placed under the supervision of the police, as though they were criminals.¹

The Leonine City had been reserved by the capitulation as the territory of the Pope, where he could be independent of the Italian

¹ De Beaufort, p. 374.

Government, and he was allowed to retain the Noble Guard, the Swiss Guard, a company of gendarmes and the Palatine Guard for the defense of the Vatican, in all, some 300 or 400 men.¹ His independence did not last long. The Pontifical troops had hardly marched out of Rome, when a crowd, composed of the dregs of the populace, crossing the bridge of St. Angelo, plundered the deserted Serristori barracks, attempted to seize those which had recently been built under the colonnade of St. Peter's and tried to force their way into the Basilica. A detachment of gendarmes from the Vatican drove them off, killing two and wounding several; but the Holy Father, foreseeing that the trifling amount of liberty which had been left to him would henceforth be continually menaced, and not wishing to live in a state of permanent warfare, asked General Cadorna, through the medium of Count von Arnim, to send troops to occupy the Leonine City. The request was presented to the general while he was assisting at the march past of the Papal army; and on receiving soon after the same demand in writing from General Kanzler, he ordered two battalions of *bersaglieri* to enter the Leonine City and mount guard over St. Peter's and the Vatican. For a few days longer the Castle of St. Angelo was occupied by the *sedentarii*, or pensioned-off soldiers of the Pontifical army; but on September 27 it, too, was handed over to the Italian Government, and since then the territorial possessions of the Holy See have been limited to the Vatican, and its gardens and the villa of Castel Gandolfo.²

For the next two days and nights the wildest disorder prevailed in Rome; the Garibaldians who had entered along with the troops were joined by crowds of others brought by rail, and one of their first acts was to pillage the law courts at Monte Citorio, where the lists of criminals, the records of their sentences and other legal documents were destroyed and damage inflicted to the amount of 50,000 francs before the arrival of the Italian soldiers. The portraits and busts of the Holy Father exhibited in the shops were taken out and torn to pieces in the streets, the barracks of the Papal troops were plundered of everything they contained, the offices of the *Giornale di Roma* and of the *Osservatore Romano* were saved from being wrecked only by the timely intervention of the troops; the Papal arms placed over the gates of the palaces of the Roman nobles were pulled down and smashed, and attempts were even made to destroy those over the doors of the foreign embassies. The mob succeeded in doing so at the palace of the Portuguese envoy, and General Cadorna was obliged to make an ample apology for the outrage which his troops had failed to prevent, and to allow the arms to be re-

¹ Der Italienische Raubzug, p. 130. ² Cadorna, p. 219, p. 304.

placed.¹ Even the Roman correspondent of the Florentine journal *La Nazione* wrote: "Since two days we are without government, and rascals take advantage of it to commit crimes against property and persons under pretense of showing their zeal and their love for Italy and the King. . . . Rome has been abandoned to every organizer of agitation and disorder, to every political firebrand, to every speculator in anarchy who until now had been tramping the pavement of the hundred cities of Italy. . . . One would say that the government intended to make Rome the sink of all that is miserable in the rest of Italy."²

On the 22d a tumultuous meeting was held in the Coliseum under the guidance of persons of well-known republican opinions for the purpose of choosing a *Giunta*, or municipal council, of forty-two members; but as some of those elected held anti-monarchical principles, General Cadorna set aside the popular vote; he selected eighteen of the persons named, and, taking no notice of the protests of the Republican party, installed the new *Giunta* in the Capitol, which he had previously occupied with a strong force of *bersaglieri*. One of the first acts of the municipality was to take steps for the performance of the usual grotesque farce known as *il plebiscito*, or the vote of the people, by which the Italian Government had sought on previous occasions to justify its annexations. The Holy Father forbade all Catholics to take part in it, as they would thereby have acknowledged that the invaders were entitled to question his sovereign rights. The electoral lists were drawn up after the parochial registers, which were taken forcibly from the clergy; many of the names of the more respectable citizens were omitted and others inserted.³ To increase the number of electors, as it was well known that the Catholics would not vote, Lanza obliged the railway companies to carry gratuitously to Rome all those who gave themselves out as Roman emigrants and who were provided with certificates furnished by the authorities of the towns where they were domiciled.⁴ There descended thus upon Rome from all parts of Italy over 10,000 persons, whose aspect inspired General Cadorna with such mistrust that he thought it prudent to send strong patrols through the city on the nights preceding the vote. The formula presented to the electors, to be accepted or rejected, was: "We desire to be united to the kingdom of Italy, under the rule of King Victor Emmanuel II. and his successors;"⁵ and during all the 1st of October tickets bearing the word *Si* (yes) were distributed in the streets. To dispel all fear of foreign intervention in favor of the Sovereign Pontiff, thousands of copies of a forged letter from the

¹ De Beaufort, p. 364. ² Roman Correspondence of September 21 in *La Nazione*, September 24. ³ De Beaufort, p. 393. ⁴ Der Italienische Raubzug, p. 297; Ideville, p. 219. ⁵ Cadorna, p. 272.

King of Prussia to the Holy Father were sold in the streets, in which His Majesty was made to express his regret that he could not interfere in the Roman question, and to state that he did not doubt that if the King of Italy were under the necessity of entering the Papal territory in order to guard it against the revolutionary party, he would guarantee to His Holiness the free exercise of his spiritual authority.

The election took place on October 2. Urns to receive the tickets had been placed on high platforms at the Capitol and in each *Rione*, or quarter of the city; the commission which distributed electoral cards gave them to all who applied, without asking any questions with regard to birthplace, age or antecedents, so that many voted who could claim no right to do so, and, as the card was not given up on voting, the same person could vote as often and in as many *Rioni* as he pleased.¹ Towards evening the urns were sealed and carried to the Capitol, where the tickets were reckoned, and the total result, which was solemnly proclaimed to the people assembled before the palace, was 40,785 Yes and 46 No.

The absurdity and falsity of this result are rendered still more palpable by the well-known facts that a large number of the Roman nobility remained faithful to Pius IX., that only sixteen of the Pontifical officers entered the Italian army and that the great majority of the persons employed in the government offices gave in their resignation rather than serve the usurper.²

Thus ended the struggle which, since so many years, the heterogeneous band of conspirators, monarchical and republican, known as the revolutionary party had carried on against the Sovereign Pontiff by means of fraud, hypocrisy, calumny and violence; it had at last conquered, and the Temporal Power had ceased to exist; but the glorious era of honor and prosperity which it was hoped that the accomplishment of the unity of Italy would inaugurate has not as yet dawned for the Peninsula.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London.

¹ Der Italiensche Raubzug, p. 208. ² De Beaffort, p. 46.

"THE MAKING OF RELIGION."¹

NO sphere of research has more occupied modern investigators than that known as "Origins," i. e., the beginnings of things. What was this planet and the other planets like when their cycles began? From what previous condition of matter did they emerge? What has been the courses of their evolution? When did life start? What was its primal form and what the stages of this first form's multiplications and developments? How account for characteristics which mark off one order of animal life from another, and the life of man from all other kinds of life? What was the earlier condition of mind? By what stages did thought and speech come to their present advanced state? Whence the race-embracing institutions of to-day, political, social, economic, religious? What the history, the manner and the method of their changes and their growth during the unnumbered years since the natal day of human kind? Every one of these subjects and a hundred others has been made the object of years and years of study, men willingly devoting lifetimes to the acquisition of scant information in what, to the untrained mind, may appear as a very limited, if not unimportant, sphere of knowledge. Thence have resulted "specialists" and "specialties," and that which is commonly spoken of as "the scientific spirit" of our day.

The gain which has accrued to human progress from the pursuit of these various lines of inquiry and discovery is simply immense; however, it would be sheer untruth to overlook the fact that egregious blunders also have been perpetrated and perpetuated to the incalculable injury of the best and highest interests of mankind. As in a new mining country thousands of searchers are misled into staking out valueless claims and into marketing them, in good faith, maybe, at fictitious values; so in the domain of science the discovery here and there of unexpected and valuable "finds" (strokes of genius or of accident) by means of which the light of truth itself has been thrown upon hitherto obscure problems, discovery of this kind has led to all sorts of unbalanced theories, surmises and conclusions, until at last even the newly-found truth has been buried in obscurities and uncertainties as great as those from which it had been but recently set free. Fortunately, the mind of man is restless for the truth; and so, despite disappointment and mistake, the search

¹ "The Making of Religion," by Andrew Lang, M. A., LL. D. (Longmans, Green & Co.)

is taken up again and again. Little by little, a grain here and a grain there is garnered, the dross smelted away and the pure metal, viz., the fact in its natural and proper significance, shines forth in pristine beauty, a permanent benefaction to the race. Thus is science finally justified of herself and of her children.

In no field of research has more wonderful and more unexpected and more helpful things rewarded man's study than in the exploration of religion, its sources and its history; and in none, either, has more that turned out a delusion and a mistake marked the pathway of inquiry. Who knows? It may be that the lesson of failure and error was a providential one, whose beneficent effect is yet to be seen in the clearer light which is thence to illumine our views of God, of the soul and of the moral law?

These considerations and others akin are easily suggested by the recent work of Mr. Andrew Lang, the title of which heads this review. His book is a demonstration of certain blunders made by science in reaching dogmatic conclusions on the fundamental problems of religion, and a presentation on his part of certain facts and deductions which science must recognize as equally her own with those upon which she based her conclusions, but which, unfortunately, she neglected to consider in the case at issue, and which, by their nature, demand the reconsideration of the problems which she had declared closed and a reconstruction of her thesis. Mr. Lang says in effect: Good Mistress Science, I feel it a duty to call to your attention a radical blunder into which you have fallen, it strikes me, on a very important matter. You say that by means of your marvelous methods of research and criticism you have come to know in their utter simpleness the original elements of that at present complicated organization yecept religion. Two ideas, you tell us, lie at the foundation of religion, viz., the idea of a soul or spirit which survives after death and the existence of a "God" or "Gods." That these ideas are at the root of religion we can all, I think, agree; but a very respectable number of us will be loath to accept your account of their source. The original elements of these two notions you declare were neither Revelation nor Experience, but—illusions. Your conclusions may be briefly stated in these terms: "Man derived the conception of 'spirit' or 'soul' from his reflections on the phenomena of sleep, dreams, death, shadow and from the experiences of trance and hallucination. Worshiping first the departed souls of his kindred, man later extended the doctrine of spiritual beings in many directions. Ghosts or other spiritual existences fashioned on the same lines prospered until they became gods. Finally, as the result of a variety of processes, one of these gods became supreme, and at last was regarded as the one only God. Meanwhile man re-

tained his belief in the existence of his own soul, surviving after the death of the body, and so reached the conception of immortality. Thus the idea of God and of the soul are the result of early fallacious reasonings about misunderstood experiences."

Now, ma'am, simple and logical and apparently so well-bottomed on facts as your explanation and conclusion may appear, allow me to tell you in all sincerity and upon scientific grounds that neither explanation nor conclusion will hold water. Upon scientific grounds, ma'am, mind you; for nobody accepts more willingly than I do your methods and results; but in the present important instance (and I am free to confess in other instances also) you have been inconsistent with yourself; for while the evidence about religion in its early stages, which you work into your thesis, may be all well and good in one way, there are withal points of view from which you have not steadily contemplated it, and until these aspects of that evidence receive your due attention you have no right nor title, ma'am, on your own principles, to register a categorical and final answer upon the problem of the origin and early development of religion and its fundamental ideas.

The readers of the *Review* will, no doubt, differ with certain of Mr. Lang's positions just as radically and as emphatically as he does with the published results of science in the particular matter dealt with. Notwithstanding this dissent, a knowledge of his book can be of serious use to them, and through them to some of those whom they instruct, yet part of its contents must be accepted simply in the spirit of an *argumentum ad hominem*. Wherefore is the volume given lengthy consideration.

The work naturally falls into two parts: The first has to do with the rejection and, *passim*, correction of the scientific genesis of the idea of "soul" or "spirit;" the second does a like work for the explanations science offers of the concept of "Gods" and "God." In the present paper we will confine ourselves to a study of the former of these subjects, leaving the latter for a second article.

I.

The foremost writers in the field of anthropology,¹ men like Tylor, Huxley and Herbert Spencer, as well as their followers and popularizers, maintain that "trance," "vision" and "hallucination" along with dreams, shadow, effects and death played an essential part in leading primitive man to conceive of the idea of "spirit." All these writers, however, take it for granted that "trance," "vision" and "hallucination" are more unreal than even dreams. To them the phenomena of clairvoyance, thought-transference, phantasms of the

¹ i. e., "The science of man or mankind;" it includes physiology, sociology, etc.; "nothing human is foreign to it,"

dead and of the dying are at best illusions; in most cases, maybe, nothing more than skillfully planned deceptions. Therefore, their theory: Primitive man excogitated the notion of "spirit" or "soul" from fallacious reasonings upon actual experiences, viz., dreams, shadows and death and from superstitious beliefs and practises which had not in them any element of reality outside of the fears or hopes or ignorance of the believers; consequently, that fundamental element of religion, the idea of "soul" or "spirit," in its first analysis, is nothing more than an example of bad logic mixed in with great credulity and not without a seasoning, mayhap, of expert deception; it is an idea that had no basis in reality; what it was it is, a figment of the imagination.

The current scientific explanation of how the idea of "soul" originated being thus clearly set forth, Mr. Lang proceeds to demonstrate in what a thoroughly unscientific way the conclusion has been reached.

First. If the supernormal phenomena—clairvoyance, thought-transference, phantasms of the dead, etc.—be *more* real than dreams, as real as death itself, matters of actual experience, then, the inference drawn from them by savages—viz., that within man was a something separable from the body and possessed of its own activity—this inference has some sort of basis in fact; it is no longer the outcome of an illusion. By way of illustration: Mr. David Leslie, a Scottish sportsman hunting in Zululand, was alarmed about the welfare of a band of elephant hunters in his employ, who did not report to him at the appointed time and place. He sought, and after much persuasion obtained the offices of a Kaffir medicine-man. The latter went through certain ceremonies, ate some "medicine," lapsed into "trance," seemed to awake from it and then began to recount in exact detail what had happened and was happening to the hunting party. "I was told where the survivors were and what they were doing, and that in three months they would come out, but as they would not expect to find me waiting on them there so long after the time appointed, they would not pass that way. I took a particular note of all this information at the time, and to my utter amazement *it turned out correct in every particular*. It was scarcely within the bounds of possibility that this man could have ordinary intelligence of the hunters; they were scattered about in a country two hundred miles away." The easy explanation of such marvels by the savage mind was the deduction that within the medicine-man there was something independent of the body in its activities which went forth from the seer and gathered the information desired. Facts such as this gave them some experimental basis for their belief independent of their experiences of dream, shadow, etc., which

latter phenomena could also be drawn upon to strengthen the savage theory.

Were these extraordinary occurrences matters of real experience?

It is "the business of anthropology, the science of man, to examine among other things the evidence of the actual existence of those alleged unusual and supernormal phenomena, belief in which is given as one of the origins of religion." Nevertheless science and scientists have promulgated their findings without such an examination; as matter of fact, "to make this examination in the ethnographic field is almost a new labor. As we shall see, anthropologists have not hitherto investigated such things as the 'Fire-walk' of savages, uninjured in the flames, like the Three Holy Children. The world-wide savage practice of divining by hallucinations induced through gazing into a smooth deep (crystal-gazing) has been studied, I think, by no anthropologist. The veracity of 'messages' uttered by savage seers when (as they suppose) 'possessed' or 'inspired' has not been criticised and probably cannot be for lack of detailed information. The 'psychical phenomena' which answer among savages to the use of the 'divining rod' and to 'spiritist' marvels in modern times have only been glanced at. In short, all the savage parallels to the so-called 'psychical phenomena' now under discussion in England, America, Germany, Italy and France have escaped critical analysis and comparison with their civilized counterparts."

What scientists of the materialistic schools have neglected, Mr. Lang, representing the new scientific movement in the sphere of physical research, undertakes in modest measure to supply. His position, he acknowledges, can be argued only by dint of evidence highly unpopular in character among scientists and as a general rule condemned by them. Notwithstanding this fact, the evidence itself is obtained by what is a legitimate proceeding in that sphere of science to which the subject belongs—anthropology. The author follows the methods of such anthropologists as Tylor, whose work, "Primitive Culture" (London, 1891) is an admitted authority. He collects the beliefs of savages about "visions," "hallucinations," "clairvoyance" and the acquisition of knowledge through other than the normal channels of cause, and proceeds to compare these savage beliefs with attested records of similar *experiences* among living and educated men. He then outlines what he considers the legitimate scientific course in passing judgment upon them. It will not do, he maintains, to slight the task because of prejudice, nor to assume that terms like "fallacy," "mistake" and "illusion" sufficiently characterize and explain phenomena of universal and perennial occurrence. Moreover,

it is the duty of science, to his mind, to separate the actual experiences from the explanations offered of them; however absurd the latter, the former are not thereby discredited. "Say, for the sake of argument, that a person, savage or civilized, obtains in trance information about distant places of events, to him unknown and, through channels of sense, unknowable. The savage will explain this by saying that the seer's soul, shadow or spirit wandered out of the body to the distant scene. This is at present¹ an unverified theory. But still, for the sake of argument, suppose that the seer did honestly obtain this information in trance, lethargy or hypnotic sleep or any other condition. If so, the savage would have other grounds for his theory of the wandering soul than any ground presented by normal occurrences, ordinary dreams, shadows and so forth. A scientific reasoner might be expected to ask: 'Is this alleged acquisition of knowledge, not through the ordinary channels of sense, a thing *in rerum natura*?' Because if it is, we must obviously increase our list of the savage's reasons for believing in a soul; we must make his reasons include 'psychical' experiences, and there must be an x^2 region to investigate." "The real question is: Do such events occur among lower or higher races, beyond explanation by fraud and fortuitous coincidence? If so, the savage philosophy and its supposed survivals in belief will appear in a new light. And we are inclined to hold that an examination of the mass of evidence to which Mr. Tylor offers here so slight an allusion will at least make it wise to suspend our judgment, not only as to the origins of the savage theory of spirits, but as to the materialistic hypothesis of the absence of psychical element in man. . . .

"It may appear absurd to surmise that there can exist in man, savage or civilized, a faculty for acquiring information not accessible by the known channels of sense, a faculty attributed by savage philosophers to the wandering soul. But one may be permitted to quote the opinion of M. Charles Richet, professor of physiology in the Faculty of Medicine in Paris. It is not cited because M. Richet is a professor of physiology, but because he reached his conclusions after six years of minute experiment. He says: 'There exists in certain persons, at certain moments, a faculty of acquiring knowledge which has no rapport with our normal faculties of that kind.'"

Mr. Lang embodies his method, or, more correctly, his thesis, in a happy illustration, which, enriched as it is by incisive comment, readers we are sure will appreciate: "The Northern Indians call the Aurora Borealis 'Edthin,' that is, 'Deer.' Their ideas in this respect are founded on a principle one would not imagine. Expe-

¹ i. e., to Mr. Lang's mind. ² X, the algebraic sign meaning "unknown."

rience has shown them that when a hairy deer-skin is briskly stroked with the hand on a dark night, it will emit sparks of electrical fire. So says Hearne in his 'Journey,' published in 1795 (p. 346).

"This observation of the Red Men is a kind of parable representing a part of the purport of the following treatise. The Indians, making a hasty inference from a trivial phenomenon, arrived unawares at a probably correct conclusion, long unknown to civilized science. They connected the Aurora Borealis with electricity, supposing that multitudes of deer in the sky rubbed the sparks out of each other! . . .

"Now, my purpose in the earlier part of this essay is to suggest that certain phenomena of human nature, apparently as trivial as the sparks rubbed out of a deer's hide in a dark night, may indicate and may be allied to a force or forces, which, like the Aurora Borealis, may shine from one end of the heavens to the other, strangely illuminating the darkness of our destiny. Such phenomena science has ignored, as it so long ignored the sparks from the stroked deer-skin and the attractive power of rubbed amber. These trivial things were not known to be allied to the lightning or to indicate a force which man could tame and use. But just as the Indians, by a rapid careless inference, attributed the Aurora Borealis to electric influences, so (as anthropology assures us) savages everywhere have inferred the existence of soul or spirit, intelligence that

" 'Does not know the bond of Time,
Nor wear the manacles of Space,'

in part from certain apparently trivial phenomena of human faculty.

"My suggestion is that, in spite of his fantasies, the savage had possibly drawn from his premises an inference not wholly or not demonstrably erroneous. As the sparks of the deer-skin indicated electricity, so the strange lights in the night of human nature may indicate faculties which science, till of late and in a few instances, has laughed at, ignored, 'thrown aside as worthless.'

"It should be observed that I am not speaking of 'spiritualism,' a word of the worst associations, inextricably entangled with fraud, bad logic and the blindest incredulity. Some of the phenomena alluded to have, however, been claimed as their own province by 'spiritualists,' and need to be rescued from them. Mr. Tylor writes: 'The issue raised by the comparison of savage, barbaric and civilized spiritualism is this: Do the Red Indian medicine-man, the Tartar necromancer, the Highland ghost-seer and the Boston medium share the possession of belief and knowledge of the highest truth and import, which, nevertheless, the great intellectual movement of the last two centuries has simply thrown aside as worthless?' Distinguo! That does not seem to me to be the issue. In

my opinion the issue is: 'Have the Red Indian, the Tartar, the Highland seer and the Boston medium (the least reputable of the menagerie) observed, and reasoned wildly from, and counterfeited and darkened with imposture certain genuine by-products of human faculty which do not *prima facie* deserve to be thrown aside?' That, I venture to think, is the real issue."

For many, no doubt, those chapters of Mr. Lang's book, in which he presents sifted evidence in favor of the reality of various supernatural experiences, savage and civilized, will be of greatest interest. "Second-sight," "crystal-gazing," "divining," "spiritualism," "haunted houses," et cetera, are illustrated by cases which certainly startle and also convince the candid reader that investigation in this weird field has made progress all-sufficient to justify the author's contention that the other sciences should no longer treat psychical research as the Cinderella of the scientific family, leaving her "to murmur of her fairies among the cinders of the hearth, while they go forth to the ball and dance with provincial mayors at the festivities of the British Association!" The chapter also on "Demoniacal Possession" might not be altogether wanting in utility to those who have followed or taken part in recent controversy anent the reality of that condition. The thoughtful reader, therefore, who turns to the book and works his way through it leisurely has many an instructive hour before him; although, as already noted—and it is still to be repeated—the absolute correctness of Mr. Lang's position, much as one may also disagree with the materialistic phase of science he contends against, may be neither so evident nor so absolute as the author himself esteems it. In one matter, however, he is beyond cavil. At the outset of this paper it was remarked that much as science has added to the sum total of knowledge, science also has perpetrated radical blunders. This very evident truth the author is not content to let go with the mere saying; he dwells upon it in the course of a long chapter which he describes as "a historical sketch of the relations between science and the so-called 'miraculous' in the past." Rich in quaint information and logical remark as this entire chapter is, there are two points touched upon of special interest to Catholics, and to these the last part of the present article will be confined.

The first of the two subjects referred to is the far-reaching fact that very little *can* be known about the primitive savages, in whose mental operations science seeks to find the original elements of the idea of "spirit:" "The savages who *ex hypothesi* evolved the doctrine of souls lie beyond our ken, far behind the modern savages, among whom we find belief not only in souls and ghosts, but in moral gods. About the psychical condition of the savages who

worked out the theory of souls and founded religion, we necessarily know nothing. If there be such experiences as clairvoyance, telepathy, and so on, these unknown ancestors of ours may (for all that we can tell) have been peculiarly open to them, and therefore peculiarly apt to believe in separable souls. In fact, when we write about these far-off founders of religion, we guess in the dark or by the flickering light of analogy. The lower animals have faculties (as in their power of finding their way home through new unknown regions and in the ants' modes of acquiring and communicating knowledge to each other) which are mysteries to us. The terror of dogs in 'haunted houses' and of horses in passing 'haunted' scenes has often been reported, and is alluded to briefly by Mr. Tylor. Balaam's ass and the dogs which crouched and whined before Athene, whom Eumæus could not see, are 'classical' instances.

"The weakness of the anthropological argument here is, we must repeat, that we know little more about the mental condition and experiences of the early thinkers who developed the doctrine of souls than we know about the mental condition and experiences of the lower animals. And the more firmly a philosopher believes in the Darwinian hypothesis, the less, he must admit, can he suppose himself to know about the twilight ages between the lower animal and the fully evolved man. What kind of a creature was man when he first conceived the germs or received the light of religion? All is guess work here!"¹ The import of this fact is far-reaching and fundamental for the whole domain of science; especially when we remember that science views askance all theory or deduction not based on actual experimentation or tested historical evidence!

The other subject treated in this second chapter, to which we consider it well to direct attention, is the effective way in which the philosophy of Hume (who brushed aside any pretended miraculous event as, *ipso facto*, unworthy of credence) is done for: "Hume derided the observation and study of what he called 'Miracles' in the field of experience, and he looked for an *a priori* argument which would forever settle the question without examination of facts. In an age of experimental philosophy, which derided *a priori* methods, this was Hume's great contribution to knowledge. His famous argument, the joy of many an honest breast, is a tissue of fallacies which might be given for exposure to beginners in logic as an elementary exercise. In announcing his discovery, Hume amusingly displays the self-complacency and the want of humor with which we Scots are commonly charged by our critics:

¹ i. e., of course as far as Anthropology is concerned.

"I flatter myself that I have discovered an argument which, if just, will, with the wise and learned, be an everlasting check to all kinds of superstitious delusions, and consequently will be useful as long as the world endures.'"

After remarking on one of this philosopher's many contradictions, Mr. Lang continues: "Thus Hume first denies the existence of such evidence, given in such circumstances as he demands, and then he produces an example of that very kind of evidence. Having done this, he abandons (as Mr. Wallace observes) his original assertion that the evidence does not exist, and takes refuge in alleging 'the absolute impossibility' of the events which the evidence supports. Thus Hume poses as a perfect judge of the possible in a kind of omniscience. He takes his stand on the uniformity of all experience that is not hostile to his idea of the possible, and dismisses all testimony to other experience, even when it reaches his standard of evidence." "It is wisdom, according to Hume, to dismiss the most public and well-attested 'miracles' without examination."

Oddly enough, nevertheless, the day dawned when science seemed to have discovered a "natural" explanation of phenomena which previously had been esteemed miraculous! What happened then? "A parallel case of a 'miracle,' the stigmata of St. Francis was, of course, regarded by science as a fable or a fraud. But now that blisters and other lesions can be produced by suggestion, the fable has become a probable fact and, therefore, not a miracle at all. Mr. James remarks: 'As so often happens, a fact is denied till a welcome interpretation comes with it. Then it is admitted readily enough, and evidence quite insufficient to back a claim, so long as the Church had an interest in it, proves to be quite sufficient for modern scientific enlightenment the moment that it appears that a reputed saint can thereby be claimed as a case of 'hystero-epilepsy.'

"But the Church continues to have an interest in the matter. As the class of facts which Hume declined to examine begins to be gradually admitted by science, the thing becomes clear. The evidence which could safely convey these now admittedly possible facts, say from the time of Christ, is so far proved to be not necessarily mythical, proved to be not incapable of carrying statements probably correct which once seemed absolutely false. If so, where, precisely, ends its power of carrying facts? Thus considered, the kinds of marvelous events recorded in the Gospels, for example, are no longer to be dismissed on *a priori* grounds as 'mythical.' We cannot now discard evidence as necessarily false because it clashes with our present ideas of the possible, when we have to acknowledge that the very same evidence may safely convey to us facts which

clashed with our fathers' notions of what is possible, but which are now accepted. Our notions of the possible cease to be a criterion of truth or falsehood, and our contempt for the Gospels as myths must slowly die, as 'miracle' after 'miracle' is brought within the realm of acknowledged law. With each such admission the hypothesis that the Gospel evidence is mythical must grow weaker, and weaker must grow the negative certainty of popular science.

"Examples of the folly of *a priori* negation are common. The British Association refused to hear the essay which Braid, the inventor of the word 'hypnotism,' had written upon the subject. Braid, Elliotson and other English inquirers of the mid-century, were subjected to such persecutions as official science could inflict. We read of M. Deslon, a disciple of Mesmer, about 1783, that he was 'condemned by the Faculty of Medicine, without any examination of the facts.' The Inquisition proceeded more fairly than these scientific obscurantists."

The author's conclusion is clear-cut and striking: "This brief sketch shows that science is confronted by certain facts, which in his time Hume dismissed as incredible miracles, beneath the contempt of the wise and learned! The scientific world laughed not so long ago at Ogham inscriptions, meteorites, and at palæolithic weapons as impostures or freaks of nature. Now nobody has any doubt on these matters, and clairvoyance, thought-transference and telepathy may, not inconceivably, be as fortunate in the long run as meteorites or as the more usual phenomena of hypnotism.

"It is only Lord Kevlin who now maintains, or lately maintained, that in hypnotism there is nothing at all but fraud and malobservation. In years to come it may be that only some similar belated voice will cry out that in thought-transference there is nothing but malobservation and fraud. At present the serious attention and careful experiment needed for the establishment of the facts are more common among French than among English men of science. When published these experiments, if they contain any affirmative instances, are denounced as 'superstitious' or criticized after what we must charitably deem to be a very hasty glance by the guides of popular opinion."

In presence of the facts collected by Mr. Lang and of his very logical remarks, we think it permissible to venture a suggestion: since those who are supposed to know somewhat of Science and serve her faithfully find reason ever and anon and on scientific grounds for reforming certain of her dogmas, it may be advisable for those who wait outside the magic circle of her adepts to hold their own judgments in patient reserve; not too easily accept her every dictum as absolute truth, especially pronunciamientos that are

supposed to shake the foundations of man's fondest hopes and beliefs. When the necessary conditions of reliable scientific work, viz., experimentation and tried historical evidence, have been fulfilled, then accept the words of Science with the degree of certainty the nature of her subject-matter in each instance demands; but when here and there through the upbuilding of a demonstration you find a stratum of surmise, a cluster of possibilities, or a bold attempt at a guess, measure your acceptance of her results by corresponding restrictions. Josh Billings' homely admonition applies here as elsewhere: "Better not to know so many things than to know so many things that ain't so." See how much in the present instance Science has claimed to have established finally and dogmatically; step by step she could describe for you man's first mental processes and their mistaken results; nothing of importance was beyond her ken! Science could overlook or dismiss with a shrug of the shoulders "spiritual" phenomena of world-wide and time-long existence, and yet tell you all about the origin of the idea of "spirit?" Besides, it is ever to be borne in mind that we have not the least assured ground for believing the laws of exact science to be the only laws at work in the world: "Science, however exact, does not pretend to have discovered all laws." Withal Science goes right ahead as if this unassur-
ance were assurance doubly sure; and woe betide him who dares think or say otherwise: at once he is branded as behind his day, an idiosyncrasy in the path of Progress. No wonder, then, that Mr. Lang appeals again and again for the open hearing, which, notwithstanding his strong premises (even from a scientific standpoint) and the candor of his convictions, he evidently has small hope of obtaining. In this, too, there is a Nemesis; for Mr. Lang himself rests all too easily in the belief that if research should by some chance do away with the actualness of the experiences which he makes the core of his argument, then, indeed, the idea of "spirit" must resolve itself into a figment of the imagination; as if the unreality of telepathy, clairvoyance, etc., should they prove unreal, would be equivalent to or necessitate the non-existence of soul! Fundamentally weak as this position may be in the present state of our ignoscience in regard to these phenomena, it possesses serious importance and within proper restriction has its effectiveness as a corrective of the current materialistic drift of scientific work; wherefore has it been thought worth while to deal with it at such length.

JOSEPH V. TRACY.

THE LATEST OUTBURST OF BIGOTRY.

FACING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. OUR COUNTRY: ITS POWER AND PERIL.

By James M. King, General Secretary National League for the Protection of American Institutions. New York: 1899.

THE religious bigot, like the troublesome small boy, has the disagreeable knack of making his presence felt just at the most inopportune times. There certainly never has been a time, since the United States became a nation, when we were less disposed or less prepared to raise sectarian issues than in this present hour, when we find ourselves confronted with so many serious and delicate problems, which we can hope to solve only through the calm judgment of a united people. We are not apprised that the "National League," of which Mr. King is "General Secretary," distinguished itself to any appreciable extent by "protecting American institutions" on the field of battle, and although this writer delights in statistics, he nowhere informs us how many of his consociates are to be found among our brave soldiers and sailors. The genuine and the mock patriotism, the patriotism which fights and bleeds and the patriotism which confines itself to idle vaporings and to malignant attacks upon loyal fellow-citizens, are not wont to dwell in the same tent. One consoling result of our Civil War was that it gave the vast bulk of our countrymen their first opportunity for beholding the Catholic Church as she really is, and emancipated them from the tyranny of Protestant prejudice, at least in its grosser forms. Up to that time, owing to the narrowness and provincialism of our national life, the No-Popery howlers had a clear field, and their vile calumnies and wild denunciations fell on fertile soil. In those halcyon days of bigotry it required but little effort to rouse the fanaticism of the mob. But in proportion as the mental horizon of the population has expanded, Protestantism, which is essentially a religion of negation and hatred, has lost its hold on the nation, and the task of the professional anti-Catholic agitator has ceased to be an easy one.

There is something supremely humorous, and all the more humorous because the author has himself no developed sense of humor, in Mr. King's reiterated lamentation that our statesmen, the public press and the people at large cannot be made to see that which he beholds so clearly with his jaundiced eye, namely, that the very existence of our country is imperiled by the "claims of politico-ecclesiastical Romanism." But in view of the fact that these claims are unknown even to the Pope and have no existence outside the

warped imagination of Mr. King and his fellow Leaguers, we cannot be surprised at the apathy and nonchalance of those whose office it is to watch over our liberties. Besides, it has grown into an axiom in American public life that religious bigotry and suicide are convertible terms; and since a propensity to self-slaughter is a weakness from which our aspirants to popular favor are notoriously exempt, we wish that every one of them would read our author's narrative of the dismal fate which has overtaken all those who have sought to rise in politics or business by attacking or slandering the religious principles of their fellow-citizens. As for assaults upon the Catholic faith, he proves to demonstration that our Catholic people stand ready to resent the slightest slur cast upon their religion. Indeed, one of the interesting passages in a very stupid book is his account of the famous "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" episode in the Presidential campaign of 1884, in which it seems he was a prominent actor. We agree with him that the incident is "pregnant with instruction," and only regret that he has derived so little benefit from that which has served the country generally as a solemn lesson. We shall let him tell the story in his own words.

"On the morning of October 29, 1884, about a thousand clergymen of New York and vicinity assembled at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in the city of New York to meet James G. Blaine, the Republican candidate for the Presidency. When the list of names of those present is perused it must be admitted that they were not only representative, but that an overwhelming majority of the Protestant ministers of the great centre of population were present. They had been invited by a printed, unsigned card sent out by a clergyman, Rev. Dr. McMurdy, who was serving the Republican National Committee in some capacity. Two or three days previous to the meeting, Dr. Spear and Dr. Armitage requested the writer to prepare some resolutions to be presented to the meeting for its action. He did as they requested. When the clergymen were assembled in the parlors of the hotel, Rev. Dr. S. D. Burchard, being the pastor of the longest consecutive service in the city, was chosen chairman, and Rev. Dr. MacArthur was chosen secretary. The resolutions which had been prepared were presented and their author moved their adoption. They were seconded in a speech made by Dr. Spear and then adopted. The writer, known to be well acquainted with Mr. Blaine, was appointed to wait upon him in his rooms and request his presence, which he did, presenting him to the chairman and to the assembled ministers. Then Dr. Burchard made the address to Mr. Blaine in which he used the phrase 'Rum, Romanism and Rebellion.' Short addresses were made by Dr. Spear of the

Independent; Dr. MacArthur, of Calvary Baptist Church; Rabbi Browne, of the Temple Gates of Hope; Dr. Roberts, of the Congregational Church; Rev. S. B. Halliday, of Plymouth Church, and Mr. Lawrence, of the Friends. Then Mr. Blaine made his address, which in intellectual grasp was perhaps the most remarkable of all his scores of speeches delivered during the campaign. After Dr. Burchard had made his speech and two or three other brief addresses had been made, Mr. Blaine turned to the writer and said: "That "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" remark of Dr. Burchard is exceedingly unfortunate. I wish you would see Mr. — (who was editor of a prominent New York daily) and with him get the press reporters to suppress the remark." The following Sunday circulars giving the famous phrase and appealing to sectarian prejudice and hate were extensively distributed at the doors of Roman Catholic churches, and as a result it is claimed that the solid Roman Catholic vote was massed against Blaine. If this is true, then a vote that could be thus, and for that reason, suddenly and without opportunity for argument, alienated from one candidate and massed for another is a peril to the Republic."

To begin where the author ends, we wish to point out that this concluding sentence gives in a nutshell the idea foolishly entertained by Mr. King and his associates regarding the constitution of "Romanism" as a "politico-ecclesiastical" body. So far as I have been able to penetrate into the inner thought of a writer who is utterly impervious to logic and whose bulky volume is full of mutually destructive statements, the fundamental fallacy which disturbs their repose is this: "Romanism," it seems, is a vast organization recruited from and perpetuated by the dregs of the population throughout Christendom, marshalled like cattle by officers called priests and bishops, who are themselves the blind, unscrupulous tools of a "foreign potentate," the infallible Pope of Rome, the autocratic and irresponsible dictator of thought and action to the entire body. Easy-going Americans have made the mistake of assuming that the Catholic Church is a religion, solicitous for the amelioration of mankind and the salvation of souls. Nothing could be wider of the mark. It is simply "a system which, wearing a triple crown of tyranny, enforces disgusting arrogance, blasphemous claims, refined perfidy, compelled ignorance and assassinated individuality." (p. 205). The aforesaid Americans are all the more inexcusable because they might have read the Papal claims set forth at considerable length by the venomous apostate Von Schulte, who certainly is, in the estimation of Mr. King, an all-sufficient and thoroughly reliable witness. His exposition of Popery can be found on page 188 *et seq.*, and is of a nature to make every patriot tremble for his coun-

try. We shall not inflict it on our readers, for, in the language of Dean Swift, it merely

"Revives the libels born to die,
Which *Pope* must bear as well as I."

But it suits our reverend maligner's purpose to concede to the apostate that same measure of infallibility which his soul revolts against in the Bishop of Rome. Do not produce any Roman doctors in rebuttal. "Such men as Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Keane and Archbishop Ireland are permitted to give vent to liberal, patriotic and tolerant utterances for consumption by the easily deceived among Americans; but they are not speaking by authority, but schooling the public mind for new encroachments, and they are easily halted when they give too loose rein to their tongues or pens." In other words, the only trustworthy witnesses to the true character of Catholicism are its sworn enemies, mainly degraded ex-priests and narrow bigots of the "National League." To endeavor to hold a serious argument with such a man would, of course, argue a folly equal to his own. All that can be done is to expose the insipidity and childishness of his utterances for the benefit of those who lack the time or the patience to follow him through seven hundred mortal pages of monotonous abuse. His treatment of the Blaine incident is a fair specimen of his general mode of procedure.

He undertakes to draw two conclusions from the story, not having wit enough to perceive that they mutually destroy each other. First he represents the "solid Roman Catholic vote" as "massed against Blaine," and proceeds to rant upon the "peril to the Republic" therein implied. A page or two later he tells us that the vote in New York State was already so close that "a change of six hundred votes would have changed the results of the entire national election," and he mentions several incidents during the campaign which operated to the disadvantage of the Republican candidate. His hatred of the Catholics is so insane that he does not wish them to enjoy even the poor credit of having determined the election as a rebuke to Burchard for his impertinent speech and to Blaine for his cowardly silence. The truth is that many Catholics did change their vote in consequence of the incident, but not the "solid" mass, otherwise Mr. Cleveland's plurality would have run into the thousands, instead of being twelve hundred. But those who changed did so spontaneously, without the shadow of ecclesiastical dictation. It is a well-known fact that a large number of the Catholic clergy of New York State were strongly in favor of Blaine, and voted for him notwithstanding Burchard's "unfortunate remark." Naturally, a professional man makes up and changes his mind much more slowly

than the common people. Mr. Blaine, after all, had done or said nothing wrong, and a few days later gave utterance to noble sentiments which would have anchored him in popular favor had he spoken them in the presence of that reverend mob of schemers. The Catholic laity are fully as sensitive as their priests, and quicker to resent any slur upon their religion. I remember speaking about the affair some time after the election to a prominent priest of that State, and was amused to hear him say: "Unfortunately, the thing was sprung so late in the day that *we* had no time to counteract it."

The Catholic people are not in the habit of consulting their clergy as to how they shall vote, nor are they edified when any of their priests take an active share in politics. Does Mr. King know of any instance where a Catholic priest has been found imitating his friend, "Rev. Dr. McMurdy, who was serving the Republican National Committee in some capacity?" Who ever heard of priests assembling in a hotel to meet a candidate for the Presidency? On the famous Sunday of the circular one might have attended every Catholic service in the land and gone away ignorant of the fact that a heated Presidential campaign was closing that week, unless perchance some pastor should have exhorted his flock to avoid election brawls and not to sell his vote. But whilst the Catholic clergy were about their Father's business, preaching the Word of God, the Protestant churches, with few exceptions, resounded with political harangues. Does Mr. King imagine that the American people are too dull to draw their own inferences?

The main inference which the American people have drawn from the Blaine episode and from many a similar experience is that their preachers are extremely poor political advisers, and it is exhilarating to read our author's account of the growing opposition which he and his fellow-bigots encounter in their efforts to have anti-Catholic planks inserted in the platforms of the National Conventions. Their influence was supreme in 1876, in the good old days of fraudulent Hayes and Tom Nast, when the corrupt party in power endeavored to stem the rising flood of popular indignation by injecting Protestant prejudice into the campaign. It was the gambler's last throw, and the Republicans spared no effort to expel every decent Catholic out of their ranks. In this they succeeded pretty well. But they did not succeed in building up a party of anti-Catholics. Religion sits too lightly on the shoulders of our countrymen to remain a rallying cry for any length of time. The American people have no personal quarrel with "Romanism." It is a matter of total indifference to the majority of voters whether the Lord instituted two sacraments or seven. Even among the preachers the only way to keep up that hatred of Popery which is essential to

Protestantism is to continue importing ranters from Belfast and Toronto. The work of the Catholic Church is so public and so conspicuously beneficent that the American people are not compelled to borrow Mr. King's spectacles in order to study it. The Republican leaders soon came to a realizing sense of the stupidity of allowing fanatics to dictate their policy and to utilize their organization for the dissemination of sectarian literature. In order to make amends for their temporary insanity and to coax back to their ranks those whom they had alienated, they boldly placed a distinguished Catholic at the head of the National Committee and paid scant courtesy to the "National League." This infamous libel of King's would no doubt have appeared in 1876 under the patronage of the Republican party as a companion to the wretched screed, "Vaticanism in Germany and the United States," which was published as a "political pamphlet" by the "Union Republican Congressional Executive Committee" in Washington. But we venture the prophecy that that egregious blunder will not be repeated in the coming Presidential campaign.

The Catholics of this country are asking no favors from any political party or candidate, but they do insist most emphatically that their religious instincts and principles be respected. We cannot read without a smile the author's dolorous narrative of the solemn snub administered to his fanatics by both parties in their last two National Conventions. We have no apprehension that next year's conventions will be any more favorable to the lost cause of religious intolerance. Nor do we regret in the least the efforts made by the "National League" and kindred organizations to commit the political parties to declarations insulting to Catholics; for, as he sorrowfully admits, the outcome was a frank pronouncement by both parties in favor of religious liberty. The Republicans, disciplined by a dearly bought experience, made, in 1892, the following noble declaration of principles, which we can all heartily endorse:

"The ultimate reliance of free popular government is the intelligence of the people and the maintenance of freedom among men. We therefore declare anew our devotion to liberty of thought and conscience, of speech and press, and approve all agencies and instruments which contribute to the education of the children of the land; but while insisting upon the fullest measure of religious liberty, we are opposed to any union of Church and State."

Not to be outdone by their rivals, the Democrats delivered themselves as follows:

"Popular education being the only safe basis of popular suffrage, we recommend to the several States most liberal appropriations for the public schools. Free public schools are the nursery of good

government, and they have always received the fostering care of the Democratic party, which favors every means of increasing intelligence. Freedom of education being an essential of civil and religious liberty, as well as a necessity for the development of intelligence, must not be interfered with under any pretext whatever. We are opposed to State interference with parental rights and rights of conscience in the education of children as an infringement of the fundamental Democratic doctrine that the largest individual liberty consistent with the rights of others insures the highest type of American citizenship and the best government."

The Catholics of America owe a deep debt of gratitude to the A. P. A. and to the "National League" for having been the indirect cause of the issuance of these two noble deliverances, which might have been drawn up and subscribed to by the Bishops in Council. The bigots had gone to the conventions clamoring for stones, and instead they got wholesome bread. It is one of Mr. King's hallucinations that anti-Catholics enjoy the exclusive privilege of endeavoring to exert an influence on political parties; that a Catholic prelate who should raise his voice in opposition to the intrigues and lobbyings of our sworn enemies would be guilty of a most heinous crime. Now we can assure him that religion will disappear out of politics, as an annoying sectarian issue, just as soon as he and his friends retire from business; but not one moment sooner. He has not to deal with emigrants from Europe, like his predecessors of a generation ago; the majority of American Catholics at the present day are native born, and trained to fighting bigotry with American weapons from their childhood. We neither overestimate the power of organizations like his, nor do we underestimate their baneful influence upon women and innocent country people whom modern civilization has not yet reached, but who remind us of the *pagani* of the ancient Roman world who were so late in learning the *Good News* announced by the messengers of Christianity.

Many Catholics in times past have sought to curry favor with non-Catholics by becoming renegades to the religion of their fathers. Now, if we could believe Mr. King's statements, the wind has completely veered around. Let the weak-kneed amongst us ponder the following words of the General Secretary:

"About ten millions is the outside rational limit claim for the numbers of Roman Catholics in our population of over seventy millions, yet under the general government and under local governments where they control the balance of power at the polls, they hold a number of offices more nearly representative of the ratio due to sixty millions than to ten millions" (p. 311).

Think of it! Out of seven office-holders caught up at random,

six are likely to be Catholics. Convince our office-loving countrymen that this is the case and you will witness a stampede towards Romanism unparalleled since the conversion of Constantine. But, unfortunately, this is merely another mare's-nest with no existence outside of Mr. King's disordered brain. A fair proportion of the brawny sons of Catholic Erin may, indeed, be seen among the police and in other subordinate positions; but when there is question of high and remunerative offices, the Catholics are conspicuous for their absence. Our author affords us an instructive illustration on page 303, where he informs us that whilst "the Catholic *Cadets*" at West Point are "few in number"—about ten per cent. of the entire corps—yet "the Catholics outnumber the Protestants among the *enlisted men*." We regret to say, therefore, that the day has not yet arrived when any one can follow the Lord into the Catholic communion with any reasonable expectation of an increased supply of political loaves and fishes. And this is all we care to say at present regarding Mr. King's insipid effusion.

J. F. LOUGHLIN, D.D.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE CATECHISM EXPLAINED; an Exhaustive Exposition of the Christian Religion, with special reference to the present state of society and the spirit of the age. From the original of Rev. Francis Spirago. Edited by Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J. 8vo, pp. 720. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- FRA GIROLAMO SAVONAROLA; a Biographical Study based on Contemporary Documents. By Herbert Lucas, of the Society of Jesus. 8vo, pp. xxii., 474. London: Sands & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- THE TRAGEDY OF CALVARY. By the Abbe Henry Bolo. 12mo. pp. 287. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE SAINTS. St. Louis. By Marius Sepet. With Preface by George Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo., pp. 233. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Bros.
- CARMEL, IN ENGLAND; a History of the English Mission of the Discalced Carmelites. 1615-1849. Drawn from documents preserved in the Archives of the Order. By Father B. Zimmerman. 12mo., pp. 399. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Bros.
- THE LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. With eight illustrations by Paul Woodroffe; 12mo., pp. 277. London: Kegan Paul, etc. New York: Benziger Bros.
- EXTERNAL RELIGION; its use and abuse. By George Tyrrell, S. J. 12mo., pp. 160. London: Sands & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- SACERDOS RITE INSTITUTUS PIIS EXERCITATIONIBUS MENSTRUÆ RECOLLECTIONIS: *Auctore P. Adulpho Petit, S. J.* Series Prima, Secunda, Tertia, Quarta, et Quinta. 16mo. Typis Societatis Sancti Augustini, Desclée, De Brouwer et Socii. Brugis et Insulis.
- IDYLS OF KILLOWEN; a Soggarth's Secular Verses. By the Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J. 12mo., pp. 140. London: James Bowden.
- THE DOUBTFUL GRANT OF IRELAND BY POPE ADRIAN IV. TO KING HENRY II. INVESTIGATED. By Lawrence Ginnell. 8vo., pp. 160. Dublin: Fallon & Co.
- THE FLOWER OF THE NEW WORLD; being a Short History of St. Rose of Lima. By F. M. Capes. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. Father J. Proctor, S. T. L. 12mo., pp. 190. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Bros.
- SONGS OF THE SETTLEMENT AND OTHER POEMS. By Thomas O. Hagan. 12mo., pp. 70. Toronto: William Briggs.
- L'ÉGLISE ET LA PITIE ENVERS LES ANIMAUX. Textes Originaux puisés a des sources pieuses. Premier Recueil sous la direction de La Marquise de Rambures. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. London: Burns & Oates. L. vol. in-12. Price 2fr. 50.
- BIBLISCHE STUDIEN. IV. Baud, 4 Heft: Paulus und die Gemeinde von Korinth, auf Grund der beiden Korintherbriefe. Von Dr. Ignaz Rohr. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder, 1899.

SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE.

SCIENCE GETTING BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES.

Evidences of a natural law ruling both scientific and metaphysical discussion is not difficult to find by any one in search of the phenomena of mental inquiry. The general tendency seems to be, that as new theories arise and exercise the intellectual world for a little while, failure to establish them by demonstrable proof generally results in a reaction toward older beliefs, to antagonize which the new ones had been started. When the new school of materialistic philosophy was begun it was the belief of many scientific men, very confidently stated, that we were getting down very close to the origin of things, and that it was only a matter of a very brief time ere science would be able to lay bare the most hidden secrets of nature and life, and with these, as a natural consequence, of mind and spirit and the duality of human nature. To follow the clue of life, from its highest expression in mankind, step by step down to the lowest in the protoplasm, was conceived to be the sure if not the very facile path of the seeker after light. Allowing for differences in bulk and structure, the laws prevailing throughout all organic life had only to be studied on the theory of some simple universal underlying principle, in order to establish the proof of a material reason for all the phenomena of life, and shatter the ancient superstition of a Divine plan in all creation. Huxley thought he was getting at the root of the mystery when he struck on the substance called protoplasm. Here was a thing which, formed from the simplest elements, seemed to afford a basis for all the complex developments of the higher forms—a thing that, by its relation to albumin, might be produced in the chemical laboratory. But this wonderful discovery has been blown to pieces by the researches of Professor Conn, of the Wesleyan University. This scientist has analyzed protoplasm, and has found it to be a very complex compound, containing fibres, liquids and granules, possessing a quasi-organism and performing its own particular part in nature's economy by means of delicately adjusted mechanism. No human power is capable of producing this bit of rudimentary life, which in its extreme simplicity, as it appeared to Professor Huxley, seemed to offer a beginning for the whole phenomena of animated nature.

Professor Conn publishes a diagram of the species of protoplasm he has selected for analysis, and this shows that it is a semi-organic creation, provided with automatic-working apparatus for the fulfil-

ment of its functions, whatever these may be. What the real character of this substance proves to Professor Conn is the utter inability of science to account for the principle of vitality in even the very lowermost scale of creation. It is equally plain, he concludes, that science, with all the chemical forces the world can command, can no longer be looked upon as capable of producing a bit of living matter. To this it may be added that it is not even able to produce of its own motion even the smallest particle of inanimate matter. It may produce a change in material form and even constituents, in many kinds of inanimate matter, but change is not creation. Science is incapable of causing the existence of the minutest atom that floats in space, and its efforts at solving how this was done in the beginning seem destined to be equally futile.

THE ASTRONOMICAL ATTRACTION OF THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

To the world of science the chief value of the forthcoming exhibition on the banks of the Seine must be its possibilities in astronomical research. These ought to be great, if all the preparations now being made for stellar exploration work out to their mathematical conclusion. Nothing so daring, in regard to dimensions of lens or focal distance had ever before been attempted. The largest apparatus at present in use is the telescope at Yerkes Observatory, and the object-glass of the Paris structure will be nearly one-third as large again as that of this famous instrument, while its focal distance will be more than three times as great. In the Yerkes structure, to be more specific, the object-glass measures 3 feet 3 inches in diameter, and the focal distance is 65 feet; while in the Paris one the diameter of the object-glass is 4 feet 1 inch, and the focal distance provided will be 195 feet. The instrument is the production of M. P. Gautier, after the plans of M. F. Delonde. Owing to the difficulty of having a dome sufficiently large for its proper movement, it is to be fixed on the plan of Foucault's siderostat—that is to say, the telescope tube will be horizontally north and south, and the face of the firmament, reflected on a mirror or siderostat, will be projected on a screen in front. This mirror will have a diameter of 6 feet 6 inches. The siderostat promises to be the triumph of dioptric construction. It is a glass cylinder 2 metres in diameter, 27 centimetres (14.6 inches) thick and weighing 3,600 kilograms (7,920 pounds). It is set in a frame of barrel weighir/g

3,100 kilograms (6,820 pounds) and is kept in balance by a system of weights and counterpoises. All this is fixed in a mounting whose weight is 15,000 kilograms (16 tons). The base of this mounting floats in a vessel of mercury that supports nine-tenths of this weight. Thus the clockwork that runs the apparatus has to move only a mass of 1,500 kilograms. The object-glasses intended for visual observations and for photographic work are mounted together on the same car, which moves on rails in such a manner that either can be easily fitted to the end of the telescope that is nearest to the siderostat. The flint-glass as well as the crown-glass sections can be separated to allow of the removal of dust. M. Barre, the chief of the French National Observatory, has described the instrument in *Nature*, but he is conservative in his opinions as to the probable results to be obtained from it. Yet, even allowing for possible drawbacks at the beginning, these can hardly fail to be of enormous value to astronomical science.

PAPER AS AN HISTORICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL FACTOR

Sufficient attention is not generally paid to the importance of paper as an agency in civilization. Within the memory of living men the utilization of this agency has increased so enormously as to defy all attempts at computation. With the improvements in printing machinery, enabling millions of copies to be thrown off where formerly there could only be thousands, and the spread of the printing press all over the known world, the demand for paper has grown in incalculable ratio. One serious effect of this increased demand is the deterioration in quality of the materials used for the manufacture of the article. The paper made from straw and wood pulp becomes so brittle after a little use as to melt away after a very brief time. There are other compounds, including a sort of clay, which enter into the composition of paper to make the product more perishable still. So grave has the question of the durability of paper become that the Holy Father has entrusted the question of the material of historical documents to a committee of experts at the Vatican. Public documents are presently being printed in many countries on paper which must certainly perish before many years are over. It was gravely stated not very long ago that the State archives in Washington are printed on such material that not one of them can be available for historical purposes a hundred years hence.

It is impossible to exaggerate the seriousness of such a contingency as such a vista as this opens up. It cannot but lead to innumerable complications between individuals and communities, perhaps even between States and outside nations.

It is a curious fact that concurrently with the discovery of improved methods of paper manufacture we find deleterious effects, resulting from these improvements, upon human physiology. The glazed surfaces of new papers are accountable, many oculists say, for a widespread deterioration of eyesight. The mischievous effects of small type were in themselves an evil of sufficient magnitude without having the dangers of highly calendered paper superadded. The old rag paper had an enormous superiority over these highly finished products of the paper mill. It was durable and its surface was pleasant to the eye. The taste for brilliant colors in printing and high art in typography has necessitated the introduction of highly glazed surfaces and intense whiteness in papers. Medical and optical science shows this so-called advance in art to be altogether in a wrong direction. As the *Druggists' Circular* remarks: "In the old books or letters, with a mild and soothing light, the surface contrasted easily from the thicker and darker type or writing characters; now the highly glazed surface offers reflections of the light which, with the more elaborate and thinner type, produces a lot of shades and lights which are most trying to the eyes. The paper has often to be turned in various directions to be seen more clearly in order to distinguish the gray (or maybe other shades) of the type from the shining white of the paper. This is similar in effect to the result of trying to decipher writing in the dusk. An experiment would prove this."

Doctors now propose that the public inspectors of schools should order the use of sanitary paper for the eyes, by which they mean that a glazed or highly polished surface should be avoided, and the colors chosen should rather be gray or light blue, but no white, and, in fact, no brilliant colors at all. The type should be clear and simple, and not too thin.

We plume ourselves mightily on the "progressive spirit" of our age, and believe there were never before such very clever people in the world. In printing especially we believe ourselves to have made the most stupendous strides. But to test the truth of such a boast, let any one take up a book printed only ten years ago and compare it with one of the last century. Here, for instance, is a copy of one of Swift's works, printed in Dublin in the year 1704. The paper is strong, with hardly a tinge of discoloration after its nearly two centuries of wear and tear, the type is beautifully clear and neatly arranged, and the binding so solid and uninjured as to promise to

last for centuries yet. What is the case with the modern book? The covers are hanging from the back, the paper is faded and chipping at the angles and frowsy at the edges; and the only thing that will stand comparison with the old product of the hand-press is the type; but even this is not a whit better or more tasteful than the old lettering. The oculists' business was not quite so flourishing in the days of Swift as in our own, but advance in that direction cannot logically be described as unqualified progress.

THE PERPETUAL MOTION HOBBY AGAIN.

Our venerable friend, the theory of mechanical perpetual motion, which seems as difficult to kill as the sea serpent, has once more bobbed up. The immediate cause of his emergence from the vasty deep is the discussion over the wonderful possibilities of liquid air. Mr. Tripler, the eminent New York scientist, who has created such a stir by his application of the newly-discovered principle, denies there is ground for the deduction of a demonstration of perpetual motion from what he has been exhibiting. But, inasmuch as he claims to be able to realize the apparent paradox of "something out of nothing" in his method of evolving liquid air, other scientists maintain that the process he explains has its logical termination in the establishment of perpetual motion as an attainable thing in physics. The *rationale* of his process is described by Mr. Tripler himself. "The heat of atmosphere," he says, "boils the liquid air in my engine and produces power just exactly as the heat of coal boils water and drives off steam. I simply use another form of heat. I get my power from the heat of the sun; so does every other producer of power. Coal is only a form of the sun's energy stored up. The perpetual-motion crank tries to utilize the attraction of gravitation, not the heat of the sun. I find that I can produce, for every two gallons of liquid air that I pour into my engine, a larger quantity of liquid air from my liquefier. I have actually made about ten gallons of liquid air in my liquefier by the use of about three gallons in my engine. There is, therefore, a surplusage of seven gallons that has cost me nothing and which I can use elsewhere as power." This, however, so far from being regarded as a disproof of the perpetual motion theory, is accepted by other scientists as a plain exposition of a means of demonstrating it. Says a writer in the *Electrical World and Electrical Engineer*: "If three gallons of liquid air be put into a liquid air engine, then it is claimed that the

engine will be able to compress and liquefy air to the extent not merely of three gallons, but even of ten gallons. Were this true, it would be evident that by continuing the operation of engines of this character we could—starting with three gallons of liquid air—produce an unlimited quantity of this material, and if such engines were allowed to work indefinitely, which, of course, they could do if they required no extraneous energy to drive them, the whole atmosphere on the surface of our globe might ultimately become liquefied. The mere suggestion of this consequence should prove a *reductio ad absurdum*.” Whatever the logic of the propositions which Mr. Tripler seeks to establish by his experiments in liquid air manufacture, the practical world, which is never frightened by a regard for the security of accepted dialectical axioms, seems to be taking the matter up very seriously. Companies are being formed, we perceive, for the application of liquid air as a motive power. It is not for us to say whether these are likely to be more successful than the Keely Motor combinations or not; but the final determination of the new perpetual motion argument raised over the subject must be awaited with interest.

SCIENCE AND METAPHYSICS.

One of the most surprising foibles of the atheistical school of scientists is their tendency to attribute to Nature a power which they scoff at when it is claimed for an Almighty Creator. Formerly it was “blind force” which was held accountable for the myriad phenomena of the visible universe; now it is Nature which works with an intelligence so subtle as to be able to discover instinctively the adaptation of means to ends in the ceaseless process of transformation and development. The old discussion as to “final causes” is being revived by the claims and admissions of the scientists. M. Charles Richet, editor of the *Revue Scientifique*, has announced his conversion from the principles of “determinism” to those of final causes. His study of the question “Has Nature an aim?” has led him on, by means of observation, to the conclusion, if she has not, she acts as though her object were to evolve organic from inorganic life. The arguments in which he elucidates this conclusion have been examined and dissected by another scientist, M. Sully-Prudhomme. He condemns the conclusion as inadequate to the premises, saying it savors of scientific prudence without scientific boldness. There is no “perhaps” in the matter with M. Sully-

Prudhomme. He affirms unhesitatingly that Nature has a will of her own and acts on it; in other words, that Nature is a very elevated sort of rational being. All this beating about the bush would be very amusing in the case of clever children, but when it is grown up men—men of “science”—whom we find engaged in it, it looks rather pitiful. They deny the existence of God, but they find fault with those who object to the thesis of a “final cause.”

THE QUESTION OF LONGEVITY AND OCCUPATIONS.

Some months ago the *Lancet* discussed the causes of longevity, and gave some valuable axioms on the secret of prolongation of life, deduced from observations made by careful students of the subject. Since that time one of the largest insurance companies has had tables prepared by an expert on the same topic, and these, while presenting the equation in an analytical shape, arrived at conclusions which bore out in a very striking way the theorem propounded by the great medical journal on the basis of a much more restricted field of observation. Before any scientific investigation had been made into this very interesting field of research, many illusory opinions prevailed regarding the class of pursuits most conducive to the attainment of a patriarchal age by those who labor. The men who cultivate the soil, for instance, were supposed to be more likely, from the nature of their occupation and the absence of those worries that affect men engaged in trade and commerce, to live to a ripe old age. Those who “go down to the sea in ships” were ordinarily supposed to be a very long-lived race by reason of the healthy conditions which, in the minds of those who know nothing of the hardships of the sea, amid which their lives were cast. Examination has dispelled these, as it has many other fallacies. Literary men live longer than farmers, or for that matter any other class, it is believed—a fact which shows that brain-toil, always supposed to be the most wasteful of the tissues, is the lightest form of labor. Clergymen stand at the head of the long-lived classes. A proportion of forty-two out of every 170 attain, in this class, the age of seventy. Farmers make a good second showing—forty to the others’ forty-two. Teachers are third on the list, with a proportion of thirty-four; lawyers can only produce twenty-five; and the medical faculty, which one would naturally suppose to be at the head of the list, is last of all, with the very poor figure of twenty-four out of the 170. The writer in the *Lancet* found seventy-four centen-

arians in a thousand persons whom he had examined, and the general conclusions he drew by his investigation were that, in order to attain the longest term of mortal existence, the conditions were four, viz.: 1. That the primary factor in a long life consists in an inherited durability; the vital machinery is wound up to go for a given period, and but for accidents or in spite of them it will go on till the time appointed. 2. That an important part of the primary inheritance is good digestive and nutritive power. 3. That temperance is necessary in the use of the nutritive functions both in eating and drinking and in regard to all kinds of food and drink. 4. That an energetic temperament and active habits conduce to longevity.

DUPLEX-ACTION MUSHROOMS.

We are so accustomed to read of the fatal results of poisonous fungi that it comes as a pleasant surprise to learn that mushrooms have been found to afford an antidote for poison. A French scientist, M. Physalix, who has been experimenting in the field of snake-bites and the natural remedies for those deadly mishaps, has made some important discoveries. He tried the juices of mushrooms on guinea-pigs, and found that snake-bites had no effect upon the animals into whose veins the preparation had been injected. The immunity thus conferred lasted from fifteen to twenty days. This property is inherent, he finds, in the juices of all species of mushrooms, edible as well as poisonous. In some 200 cases he used the juice obtained from the ordinary cultivated mushroom by cutting them up finely, expressing the juice, filtering the liquid and adding a small amount of chloroform as a preservative. The liquid thus obtained sometimes caused ulcers, mortification, etc., and sometimes, indeed, caused death, but the immunizing effect on the animals that survived was very marked. If a method of controlling evil effects of the antitoxin can be discovered, this discovery may be of some real value, but, judging from the author's report, the mushroom juice is as much to be feared as the snake-bite.

BOOK NOTICES.

- D. A. Mougél: *DIONYSIUS DER KARTHÄUSER, 1402-1471*. Sein Leben, sein Wirken, eine neuausgabe seiner Werke. Aus dem Französischen mit einigen Ergänzungen des verfassers in's Deutsch übersetzt von einem Priester des Karthäuser-Ordins. Mulheim, A. D. Huhr. Verlag von M. Hegner. 1898, pp. iii.
- DOCTORIS ECSTATICI D. DIONYSII CARTHUSIANI in unum corpus digesta ad fidem editionum Colonensium cura et labore Monachorum S. Ordinis Carthus, farente Leone XIII. Tom. XVII.
- SUMMA TIDEI ORTHODOXÆ (Libr. I.-III.) Pp. 566. Tom. XVIII. SUMMA TIDEI ORTHODOXÆ (Libr. III.-IV.) DIALOGION DE TIDE. Pp. 574. Monstrolii, Typis Carthusæ S. Mariæ de Pratis.

In all the thirty tomes of the *Brittanica* and its supplement one finds no mention of Dionysius the Carthusian. His name is not in the latest edition of *Johnson*, nor yet in the *Century Dictionary*. A brief and appreciative notice, however, of him is given in the *Biographie Universelle*, and a fuller article in *Wetzer & Welte's Kirchen-Lexicon*. His life has been written in Italian by Campanini, Venice, 1736, and Dinbani, Siena, 1782; in Spanish by Cassani, S. J., Madrid, 1738; in French by Welters, 1882; but the original biography is the *Vita beatæ memoriæ Dionyii Cartusiani*, by Dom Theodor Loer, given in the *Bollandists* under March 12, the day of Dionysius' death. The most recent information as to his life and works will be found in the interesting sketch by D. A. Mougél, the German version of which, with some additions, is here presented. A few facts taken from this book may here be pertinent as introductory to some remarks on the new edition of the great Carthusian's works.

Dionysius was born, in the year 1402, of respectable parentage in the little village of Ryckel, in the Belgian province of Limburg. Together with a constitution of iron he was gifted from earliest childhood with an insatiable love for knowledge, equaled only by an astounding memory and an unsurpassed intellectual penetration. Having taken his degree of doctorate at Cologne, he entered the Carthusian monastery of Roermond in 1423, laying aside most probably at this time his baptismal and family name, Heinrich Van Leeuwen, and adopting Dionysius, in reverence for his saintly patron—whose spirit he so closely afterwards assimilated—and Van Ryckel in humble memory of a seemingly lowly origin. The succeeding forty-five years of his life were passed for the most part in the cloister. Prayer, studying, writing—these three words sum up, says his latest biographer, these two-thirds of his life. Simple words they are, but with Dionysius they stood for such great mental activity that each seemed sufficient to absorb an ordinary human existence. "A Carthusian who lives up to his rule devotes about

eight hours a day to religious exercises. So far from curtailing in the least this time, Dionysius prolonged it, so that he devoted eleven to twelve hours daily to spiritual duties." An interesting document which he wrote at the command of his superiors towards the close of his life gives us some knowledge of the range of his studies. It is written with the simplicity that characterizes all his works. A portion of it runs thus: I, Brother Dionysius, thank God with all my heart for having called me in early life, at the age of twenty-one years, to the religious state. I am now by Divine grace forty-six years a Carthusian, and have during this time, thanks to God, studied indefatigably and have read many authors. On the sentences, St. Thomas, Bl. Albert, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Peter of Tarentaise, Ægidius Romanus, Richard of Middletown, Durandus (of St. Pourçain) and many others. [In the opening of his commentary on the Sentences he gives a fuller list. In it are mentioned Henry of Ghent, William of Auxerre Ulrich, Scot and Hannibal.] I have read the works of St. Jerome, especially his commentaries of the Prophets, all of Sts. Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory and Dionysius the Areopagite, my favorite author, Origen, Sts. Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril, Basil, Chrysostom and John Damascene, Boethius, Sts. Anselm and Bernard, Ven. Bede, Hugh (of St. Victor), Gerson, William of Paris and others; moreover, all the Summæ and Chronicles, Civil and Canon Law, so far as it was of service to me, further all commentaries on the Old and the New Testaments. Finally, I have studied all the philosophers whose works I could procure—Plato, Proclus, Aristotle, Avicenna, Algazel, Anaxagoras, Averroës, Alexander (of Aphrodisia), Alphorabius (Al-Farabi), Abubather (Ibu-Tofail) Evempotus (Ibu-Badja), Theophrastus, Themistius and others." [Elsewhere he adds a much larger number.] The document continues with the same simplicity. "With much difficulty, labor and weariness has this exclusively mental work been of course performed; but just for this reason has it been to me of greatest service, being helpful to me in mortifying the senses and in conquering lower tendencies; these studies, moreover, preserved in me love for my cell."

When one surveys this long list of authors one is tempted to the conclusion that Dionysius must have either read them only in part or at best superficially or, on the other hand, must have consumed his life in mere reading. Yet how far of the truth such inferences would fall is evident from the list of his written productions. The mere titles of his works if mentioned here would fill two pages of this *Review*. Three catalogues of them drawn up by himself have come down to us. One is found at the beginning of his commentary on the Pauline Epistles. Another preserved in

the Bodleian Library, Oxford, contains 118 articles. Another in the Library of Trier gives 141. Trithemius, in his *Liber de Scriptor. Eccles.*, gives a list of 144 titles taken from a catalogue made likewise by Dionysius. These writings may be roughly divided into principal works and occasional opuscula. The former cover the entire field of scholastic studies as cultivated in mediæval times. In Exegesis there are his commentaries on every book of the Sacred Scripture, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. To theology belong his work on the *Sentences* and on Boethius, his *Summa Fidei*, his *Compendium philosophicum* and *theologicum*, *Dialogion de Fide Catholica* and other special treatises. His ascetical writings include a commentary on the Areopagite, on Cassian and on Climacus, his Tracts on Prayer, Meditation, Contemplation, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, etc.

To the second class of the great Carthusian's treatises belong such as were occasioned by requests of friends and correspondents, but especially such as bear upon the social-ethical and religious state of his times. Amongst these are found his work in refutation of the Koran, his treatise *de Auctoritate Papæ et generalium Conciliorum*, on the various states of life ecclesiastical and lay, etc.

Quantity, however, is not the just gauge of an author's merit. That the quality of Dionysius' works is quite as remarkable as their number will appear to any one who cares to read them. Another test of their real merit may be found in the multiplied editions through which many of them early passed. Thus, for instance, his commentaries on the Sacred Scriptures passed in a very short time into many editions; all of them at least into three, others into eight to twenty-one. His *Monopanton* went into ten editions, the *Summa Fidei* into six, the *De IV. Novissimis* into thirty-seven; the same treatise was translated into French, Italian, Spanish, German, Flemish, etc. Various printed collections have been made from time to time of these different works, the fullest being that of Dom. Loer, printed at Cologne, 1535-1536. It has been reserved, however, to the closing year of our own century to greet a complete edition of the Dionysian writings, an edition as worthy in its splendid form as can be, both of their matter and of their author. The edition now under way will extend to forty-eight quarto volumes. Fourteen to fifteen of these tomes will be taken up with the commentaries on the Bible, twenty-six will be devoted to theological, ascetical and kindred matter, four will contain the sermons and three supplemental volumes will be given to the doubtful and the hitherto unpublished opuscula.

As an illustration of the general character of the undertaking and of the matter and spirit of the Dionysian writings generally may

be cited the two volumes placed at the head of this paper. Materially considered, these volumes are models of the printers' and the book-makers' art. Excellent paper, broad margins, large, clear letter press—they have all the features that make it a joy to take them up, and that go so far to lighten the study of matter which in itself calls for close and sustained attention. The two volumes contain two distinct theological works. The first takes up the entire first volume and about two-fifths of the second.

Its sub-title indicates its scope and contents. It is a *Medulla Operum Divi Thumæ*. Dionysius herein has taken the *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas and compressed it into smaller compass. The matter falls directly into four "Books" answering to the distinct "Parts" of the *Summa*, and these divide at once into articles which answer to the "Quæstiones." The "Articles" divide into paragraphs, each of which represents an "Article" of the *Summa*. Though not an original production, it manifests the firm grasp the author possessed of the work and thought of St. Thomas and a happy power of expression which, whilst highly condensed, is not obscure. Its value to the theologian consists chiefly in its bringing into a more easily compassed field of vision the vaster areas of the *Summa*.

The originality, penetration, learning and flexibility of the author's mind are more apparent in the work that fills the larger part of the second volume. It is made up of a Dialogue between a theologian and a philosopher covering almost the entire field of religious truth. Throughout it breathes the characteristic of the author's theological habit—an interfusing of the affective with the intellectual. Two words signalize his whole method here as elsewhere—knowledge and piety. "Above all things he is a theologian and an ascetic, or rather a theologian in the service of asceticism. Willingly would he have subscribed to the proposition of a recent writer: 'Dogma makes and reforms the nations.' He strove to know much in order to love much, for he belonged to that great family of monks of the olden time with which 'to know was to love.'"

Like the *Summa* the *Dialogion* is a work that never grows old. The one is a compend of eternal truth which though ever ancient is ever new. The other is a summary of the same truth, but shaped into a system which whilst losing none of its scientific exactness is invested with the more concrete and life elements lent to it by the conversational style. Looking over the vast spiritual and intellectual labors of Dionysius one realizes the meaning of the words of Trithemius: "Contemplationi et orationi cum tanto fervore instabat ut eum scribere nunquam putares; rursum in scribendo et legendo tam sedulus erat ut nec orare nec contemplari eum posse unquam aestimares."

Not less pertinent in this connection is the comment of his first biographer: "Neminem audiui qui viri hujus laborem sine stupore viderit, qui non senserit mecum absque ingenti miraculo fieri non potuisse ut unus vir tot scripserit libros." And yet other labors filled in his days and, we might add, his nights, for he slept usually but three out of the twenty-four hours. Besides carrying on an extensive epistolary correspondence covering all manner of difficult subjects, he occupied for a time the troublesome positions of procurator and superior in his monastery and was the companion and counsellor of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa in his long legational mission through Germany. He died March 12, 1471, and was buried in the Chartreuse of Roermond. "One lesson," observes his recent biographer, "is unmistakably conveyed by his labor-loving existence—the power of a life that knows how to have and to hold single-mindedness of purpose."

For the benefit of any of our readers who may desire to subscribe for this truly royal edition of the Dionysian writings it should here be added that the subscription price has been placed at the very modest figure of eight francs per volume (quarto). After the close of the subscription list the price is to be raised to fifteen francs. Subscriptions should be sent to the Imprimerie de Notre Dame des Prés a Neuville-S-Montreuil, France.

F. P. S.

INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICÆ SPECIALIS QUAS TRADEBAT IN COLLEGIO MAXIMO LOVANI-
ENSI. P. Stanislaus De Backer, S. J. Tom. I. Cosmologia. Pp. 361. Paris, Librairie
Del homme et Breguet, 83 Rue de Rennes, 1899.

Though the number of Latin text-books on metaphysics is not small, there will always be a welcome from earnest students for a work such as the present latest addition to the list. The claims to welcome do not lie in novelty of subject nor of argument, nor even in adjustment of the olden truths to modern discoveries and theories. What most strongly commends these *Institutiones* is the remarkable simplicity of the treatment and the perfect transparency of the style. The author does not attempt the impossible, the making of metaphysics *easy*. His treatment, however, goes as far to this end as the abstruse nature of the subject allows. In company with the more recent scholastic philosophers he adopts on the whole the analytic instead of the synthetic method followed by earlier writers. Accordingly the work opens with an analysis of the phenomena of the corporeal world—extension, quality, force, motion, etc. This prepares the way for a discussion on the various systems regarding the essential nature of bodies. Space and time come logically next. The laws of nature and the possibility of their suffering recognizable derogation receives adequate treatment. The appendix, on the nature of "Acci-

dents," will be found helpful to the young philosopher and suggestive to the older, especially the portion on "relations." The student who reads this volume will no doubt look eagerly for its successors, in which psychology and theodicy are to be treated. Though but one section of the entire work, the present volume is in itself complete and is indexed as such.

PRÆLECTIONES DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN COLLEGIO DITTON-HALL HABEBAT. Christianus Pesch, S. J. Tom. IX. DE VIRTUTIBUS MORALIBUS, DE PECCATO, DE NOVISSIMIS, pp. x. 366. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo., 1899. Price, \$2.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIÆ DOGM. TRACT. DE VERBO INCARNATO. Auctore Petro Einig, D. D., Ph. D. Pp. viii. 264. Treveris, ex Officina ad S. Paulinum, 1899. Price, 3.20 marks.

Whilst Doctor Einig's series of text-books on dogmatic theology is still advancing, Father Pesch's series has reached completion. The individual parts of both these *courses* have been commented on in this *Review* in the order of their appearance. It is but merited praise to add here that the present volumes are quite up to the high standard of excellence which we have noted as characterizing the preceding volumes. Father Pesch aptly places the crown on his work by his treatise on the moral virtues. The ripened fruit of faith and of theological science is a virtuous life. But virtue, though simple in its ultimate aim, is wonderfully complex in its psychological and spiritual genesis, functions and direct relations. It is the duty of the professional theologian, especially the priest, to have clear and fixed ideas on these states of the spiritual life, and a most efficacious help to the gaining of this information will be found in the present treatise. Sermons and instructions, properly built out of the solid truths, so strongly set forth in this volume, cannot fail of good results, not only to individual souls, but to society generally.

The same remark is pertinent to Doctor Einig's treatise on the Incarnation. Here the fruiting of dogma is not dissected, but its root and stem are studied. The "*vita quam Verbum nobis assumpsit*" is the root of the soul's highest life, and the "*vita quam nobis contulit*" is the trunk. These two aspects of our Lord's Being and Work are clearly and solidly expounded in Dr. Einig's Christology and Soteriology, the two parts into which the treatise on the Incarnation naturally divides.

CHATTERBOX. Edited by J. Erskine Clarke, M. A. 1 vol., 8vo., pp. 412. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

For the twenty-second time Chatterbox makes its annual appearance. Even a cursory glance reveals that the old-time care in editing and illustrating has suffered no diminution. Particularly is it to be commended for its freedom from misstatements regarding the Church historically and its fair treatment of Catholic subjects,

defects which are unfortunately too common in the literature usually prepared for juvenile readers.

HISTORY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, Founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincen-
tians) and of the Sisters of Charity. By Monseigneur Bougand, Bishop of Taval.
Translated from the second French edition by the Rev. Joseph Brady, C. M. With an
Introduction by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Two vols.,
8vo., pp. xxi., 338, and vii., 276. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The biography of any man who has instituted two religious communities, who has reformed and elevated his fellow-men, both lay and cleric, and who has so stamped his individuality on the times in which he lived that it has become an indelible part of them, as did St. Vincent de Paul, is always a valuable contribution to literature. But when such a biography is written by so great a master of the art as Bishop Bougand, the work is indeed invaluable.

The life of St. Vincent de Paul has been written many times, and unusually well by Abelly, his first biographer in point of time and first also in authority. Bishop Bougand quotes largely from him, and so does every other biographer. But Mgr. Bougand, the saint's latest historian, has the advantage of being able to quote from a large collection of the saint's letters, which have been found only within the last few years. These volumes of correspondence contain about 2,500 letters of the 30,000 that were in existence at the time of his death in 1660. The editor of the French edition, after calling attention to these points of excellence, adds:

"The special value of his work, however, consists less in the new matter which he brings to light than in the manner he narrates a life so well known. Thanks to his art, to his wise and clear arrangement, notwithstanding its innumerable details, the history develops itself with a charming rapidity and clearness that delight one. A quiet and restrained ardor is felt which sometimes waxes into an eloquence that moves and fascinates; in a word, his style is at once dignified and literary, graceful and vivid. Hence perusal of the book produces a deep impression. Men of the world, for whom especially it was written, believers or non-believers, will not lay it down without feeling that they have contemplated in St. Vincent de Paul, and in almost superhuman proportions, a great man and a great saint."

Such high praise is not unmerited when we remember that Mgr. Bougand had distinguished himself before taking up this work by his admirable lives of St. Jane Chantal, St. Monica and Blessed Margaret Mary, but especially by his great apologetic work in five volumes, "Christianity and the Present Age." After such a preparation he devoted the last years of his life to the present biography in order to vindicate Christianity by its saints. It may truthfully be called a sequel to the great apologetic work. Nor was the sub-

ject chosen at random. On the contrary, the author studied carefully the list of Christian heroes in order to find the one whom he might most profitably place before the present age to attract and win it. He chose St. Vincent de Paul as the one who would most directly and forcibly appeal to the spirit of the times.

Cardinal Vaughan, in the introduction which he has written for the English edition, speaks especially of its opportuneness. "A two-fold work is before the English-speaking Catholics of the world," he says, "upon the faithful execution of which must depend the influence they will eventually exert upon society. That work consists in nothing less than a reform of society and the elevation and sanctification of the priesthood." He then shows that St. Vincent de Paul devoted his life to that two-fold work, and that therefore the study of his biography must have an immense influence for good on every community.

The translation has been done by Rev. Joseph Brady, C. M., and it runs so smoothly that one forgets that it is a translation.

The book is beautifully made and the publishers are to be congratulated on their good taste and liberality. We seldom meet so happy a combination: a great saint, a master biographer, an expert translator and a liberal publisher.

J. P. T.

NATURAL LAW AND LEGAL PRACTICE. Lectures delivered at the Law School of Georgetown University. By René I. Holaind, S. J., Professor of Ethics and Sociology, Woodstock College, Lecturer on Natural and Canon Law, Georgetown University. 8vo., pp. 344. New York: Benziger Brothers.

As families increase in number and form the community; as communities multiply and form the State; as States unite and form the nation, and as nations, remaining distinct, yet form alliances for mutual profit and protection, so are different laws enacted corresponding to the needs of these various interests and regulating the claims of conflicting or disputing parties. As the world has grown, laws have multiplied and have been divided and grouped according to the various relations of men. We have made rapid progress since the first simple code of laws was framed. The lawyer of ancient times did not need a large library, to which each year new volumes were added. The laws were few and clear and stable. The modern lawyer finds himself confronted by so many complex relations in the social and business and political world that he cannot hope to master the laws bearing upon them all, and hence, after studying the foundations of law in general and legal practice, he must limit himself to some specialty. Hence in every State we find civil lawyers, criminal lawyers, orphans' court lawyers, patent lawyers and many other classes, according to the various needs of the community. Even in a limited field constant study is required if one would keep pace with the new decisions of courts and the new enactments

of legislative assemblies. In so broad a field, and with limited vision, it is not easy to see the centre: as one who is carried by a swift elevator to the top of a high building, where he transacts his business day after day, knows little or nothing about the foundations of the structure. And yet such a one would be very foolish to place a large, heavy fireproof safe in his office or to add another story to the building without first studying those foundations. So in the study of the law, we must start from the centre; we must begin with the foundations; we must master the fundamental principles. Many men fail to do this, hence so many are superficial and work harm to themselves and to their fellow-men. Unless we understand the fundamental principles of law, unless we study the natural law which underlies all others, we shall not be able to judge rightly.

Confronted by this truth Rev. René I. Holaind, S. J., delivered a course of twelve lectures before the law school of Georgetown University on Natural Law and Legal Practice.

As the author very well points out in his preface, "the complexity of laws is bewildering, but unavoidable; for it is in keeping with the nature of the human mind, which cannot comprehend a whole subject at a glance, but must break it, as it were, into fragments in order to master successively all its parts and to conquer the difficulties one by one. But if differentiation is called for, integration is no less needed; analysis presupposes principles or needs at least some *postulates*; again, it remains almost barren unless it lead to synthesis, in which all human knowledge must at last culminate. All the branches of judicature are interdependent, all assume the incompatibility of right and wrong, all rest on general principles of morality deeply rooted in human conscience and held as certain by the common sense of mankind; and yet these familiar truths need scientific treatment in order to bear a scientific superstructure." "It is to emphasize these principles and to demonstrate their soundness that these lectures have been wrtitten." In carrying out his purpose the author takes up the theories of Determinism, Utilitarianism, Positivism and other similar systems and shows their unsoundness.

Father Holaind's general learning, as well as his special fitness for such a work, give promise that it will be well done. This promise has been kept. The subject has been handled clearly and concisely, as befits such a subject, and the result is a very important contribution to ethical-legal literature. This volume should find a place awaiting it in the library of every lawyer, and theological students will be glad to place it on the same shelf with the excellent English manuals of philosophy which Father Holaind's companions in the Society of Jesus have given to the reading world in recent years.

J. P. T.

PERIODICAL

70756

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

